

9/9/25

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

PLANNING BOARD

DENISE BAGRAMIAN  
Chairwoman

VIDA SHEEHAN  
Attorney

PAULA COOPER  
Secretary



MEMBERS

Emad Andarawis  
Eric Ophardt  
Heather Fariello  
Mario Fantini  
Keith Martin  
Lisa Westrick  
Matthew Luke (alt.)

**Planning Board Minutes**  
**September 9, 2025**

Those present at the September 9, 2025 Planning Board meeting were:

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

Those absent were: None

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

Ms. Bagramian, Chairwoman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. All in attendance stood for recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Minutes Approval:**

None

9/9/25

**Public Hearing:**

None

**Old Business:**

**#2025-006 670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP**

SBL: 271.8-5-26, 271.8-5-25 Applicant proposes to construct a duplex on each lot, 670/674 Plank Rd Zoned: R1 – Residential, Status: Preliminary w/ possible determination Applicant: Trinity Place & Ten Broeck, Consultant: GVG Land Surveyor, PLLC – K. Weed Last Seen On: 08/12/2025

**Consultant/Applicant Presentation:**

Pat Jarose appeared before the board to request approval of the application. He explained that previous concerns have been addressed by reducing the size of the proposed duplexes and incorporating side-load garages. He noted that landscaping plans have been provided, and that on Lot 2, the distance between the home and the adjacent wetlands has been increased. Mr. Jarose also confirmed that a stormwater management plan has now been included in the proposal.

**Staff and Professional Comments:**

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

**Public Comments:**

No public comment.

**Planning Board Review:**

Mr. Fantini stated he has concerns still for the traffic and the stop signs being so close to the driveways. He stated this is dangerous. He stated there are single family homes in the area and feels this will decrease the property values of them. Mr. Fantini stated E-1(f), and G are not met for the standards for an SUP. Mr. Jarose stated that the duplex is allowed within the zoning and they are 4 way stop signs, not a traffic light so cars will be slower and he feels the property values should increase due to the construction, not decrease.

Ms. Bagramian stated that the perceived decrease in property values reflects a personal opinion regarding costs. Mr. Fantini asked whether documentation on property values had been provided, and noted that if the applicant cannot supply such information, he will rely on his own judgment. Ms. Bagramian stated this looks like a transition area from business to residential and thanked the applicant for adding the side load garages.

9/9/25

Mr. Andarawis stated that he has deliberated extensively on the application, but feels that the landscaping improvements have significantly addressed prior concerns. He added that he can now envision the final product. Mr. Ophardt expressed agreement, stating that the proposal has progressed substantially and that he supports the comments made by Ms. Bagramian and Mr. Andarawis. Mr. Ophardt offered Resolution #13 of 2025, second by Ms. Fariello, to waive the final hearing this application and to grant preliminary and final approval of the special use permit, conditioned upon satisfaction of the comments offered by the Planning Board, Planning Department, and Town Designated Engineer, including submitting the landscaping plan for approval to the Planning Department prior to the stamping of the Special Use Permit.

Roll Call:

- D. Bagramian - Yes
- L. Westrick - Yes
- H. Fariello - Yes
- E. Andarawis - Yes
- E. Ophardt - Yes
- K. Martin - Yes
- M. Fantini - No
- M. Luke (alternate) -

The motion was carried with six affirmative votes and one dissenting vote.

Ms. Fariello moved, second by Ms. Westrick, to waive the final hearing for this application for the site plan review of 670/674 Plank Road Tow Family Dwelling, and to grant preliminary and final site plan approval conditioned upon satisfaction of all comments provided by the Planning Department, Town Designated Engineer, and all items listed in the final comment letter issued by the Planning Department.

Ayes:   6                        Noes:   1                        The motion was carried with six affirmative votes and one dissenting vote.

**Old Business:**

**#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)**

SBL: 264.-3-5.1 Applicant proposes construction of a 5 MW solar array, Mac Elroy Rd Zoned: CR - Conservation Residential, Status: Revised Concept Applicant: DG Cooley, LLC – B. Chan, Consultant: Tetra Tech Inc. Last Seen On: 06/24/2025

**Consultant/Applicant Presentation:**

9/9/25

Billy Chan stated that the proposal is for a 5 MW solar project. He noted that revisions were made in response to the Open Space review, and the team hopes to close out the SEQRA process this evening. Mr. Chan explained that the project includes visual screening through a natural vegetative buffer and has been designed to avoid wetlands by maintaining a 100-foot setback and incorporating a retention basin for stormwater. Mr. Chan stated the applicant is keeping the forested land and clearing only 3 acres. He stated they will apply for a solar DEC permit in one area where there is only a 50' buffer shown to the wetlands.

**Staff and Professional Comments:**

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

**Public Comments:**

No public comment.

**Planning Board Review:**

Mr. Marin asked if the application is feasible to build without the 50' Wetland Buffer Intrusion permit so as to decrease the intrusiveness to the wetlands. Mr. Chan stated that this is only a small area they are looking for a DEC permit to construct. Mr. Martin asked them to submit in writing the rationale for this permit. He also stated that the screening is not adequate for a visual buffer along MacElroy.

Ms. Bagramian asked if the applicant has any visuals for the buffering they are proposing. Mr. Chan stated he believes he has some. Mr. Martin asked if they would be plantings or mature trees and how long the trees would take to mature. Mr. Chan stated the plan shows mature trees. Mr. Chan stated that they will also be using a pollinator mix to assist with the butterflies and they will be checked with the O&M. He stated that if they are found to be insufficient then replanting will be done.

Mr. Martin asked if there would be battery storage on the site. Mr. Chan stated now it is only being proposed as solar but he cannot speak for the future of the application, and there is a 50/50 chance for their possibly being another application for battery storage but it will be looked at after the solar is built.

Ms. Bagramian asked if the applicant could bring simulations of the project and go through them. Mr. Andarawis agrees that he would like to see them as well. Ms. Bagramian stated she would also like a visual from the home adjacent to the project.

Ms. Fariello stated that a condition of approval could be for the applicant to come back if battery storage is wanted. Ms. Bagramian stated they would have to as they would be changing a site

9/9/25

plan. Ms. Bagramian stated she would like to see a full build-out plan with the battery storage included.

Mr. Fantini stated that battery storage is currently banned in the Town now so it is not an issue. Ms. Bagramian stated it is not banned but there is a moratorium (Local Law #5 of Ju;y, 21,2025) so there is a potential for it and this is why she would like a full build out plan submitted. Mr. Andarawis stated that he believes that battery storage would have to be a new review with experts involved and be considered a separate project. Mr. Chan stated he is expecting to come back if battery storage is wanted. Ms. Bagramian stated she would still like to see the whole picture with view sheds included.

Mr. Ophardt pointed out the applicant's proposed vegetative screening along McElroy Road is insufficient. He stated that the current thin row of sumac bushes does very little to block the roadside view of the proposed solar panel. Mr. Ophardt recommended the all the existing sumac bushes be removed and a third layer of vegetative screen be added along the entire side of McElroy Road. Ms. Bagramian and Mr. Fantini both agreed with this proposal.

Mr. Andarawis stated he supports solar projects but they need to be done right. He stated that this is a residential area, in the CR zone, and it may screen the project but it changes the character of the area and code speaks to this which makes him question if this is the right place for solar. Mr. Andarawis stated that on Hubbs Road the project was able to be hidden behind existing vegetation so there was no change but here it will be a significant change to the view shed. Mr. Ophardt agreed. Mr. Andarawis asked what is going to happen with the rest of the property. Mr. Chang stated that to the south there is a small open area but other than that the land is forested. Mr. Chang stated that they looked at 5-6 different parcels and this was the most appropriate site. Mr. Andarawis stated the demands for solar are increasing and NYSERDA is raising their standards but they are always told they are full.

Mr. Martin stated that he always looks to preserve active farm land and this parcel is and was recently planted in soy beans and corn.

Ms. Bagramian stated she does not feel this project is the goal of the CR zoning. She stated that the adjacent land owners are Murphy and Unter, Murphy has some buffer and Unter has zero. Mr. Chan stated that there may be existing trees but he will look at it; he will provide simulations for the next meetings for all of the neighbors and look at all the areas on the property so see if it is feasible to eliminate the 50' easement. Mr. Chan stated they would also do a battery analysis for the project.

### **Old Business:**

### **#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan**

9/9/25

SBL: 259.-2-44 Applicant proposes to construct a ready-mix concrete production plant 1910 Us Rt 9, Zoned: L2 - Light Industrial 2, Status: Preliminary Applicant: L. Clemente, Consultant: EDP – G. Vuillaume Last Seen On: 04/22/2025

**Consultant/Applicant Presentation:**

Gavin Vuillaume stated they were last here in April for a concept plan. He stated not everyone was thrilled with it but they were ok with the screening and protection of the Dwaas Kill based on required setbacks within the Town Code. Mr. Vuillaume stated the Board recommended a traffic study and it was done and submitted for review. He stated that the applicant received a variance from the ZBA for the height of the building. Mr. Vuillaume stated there are 19.4 acres shown for the parcel and he went through the plan and stated that there would only be 3.5 acres of land disturbed. Mr. Vuillaume stated the entrance would be from Route 9 and the existing barns and home would remain; the home would be a buffer and the garages would be used for storage. Mr. Vuillaume stated that the project has been moved as far away from the Dwaas Kill as possible due to the presence of a sewer easement at the front of the property, which runs near Route 9. Mr. Vuillaume stated that trucks entering the property would take a turn to go towards the silo to get concrete. Mr. Vuillaume showed the location on the map of the bins for concrete as well as the processing plant for mixing. He presented the grading plan and explained how the layout is specifically designed to direct runoff into the stormwater management area. Mr. Vuillaume stated the soils are not great, they are silt and clay so there needs to be enough area dedicated to the storm water to absorb. Mr. Vuillaume showed the planting plan as well and stated there are no berms proposed but they could change this based on feedback. Mr. Vuillaume showed the erosion control plan and stated they delineated the wetlands and are waiting for DEC to confirm them. He showed the elevations and the simulated visual impacts.

Nick Clemente, applicant, stated his company operate 3 plants in New York and the concrete is made of 5 ingredients. He showed the side view drawing and explained the steps that are taken to mix the concrete. Mr. Clemente stated there are areas for washing off the trucks before they leave the site and showed a video of the trucks getting fill and explained what happens. He stated there is an air vacuum to help with dust control as the trucks get loaded.

Mr. Vuillaume stated the traffic study was done by monitoring their existing Wilton facility and the numbers are low. He stated that at peek a.m. hours the trips were 16 and for the p.m. trips were 18. He stated that the main concerns are the Dwaas Kill so they are trying to keep away from it and protect it.

**Staff and Professional Comments:**

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

Mr. Jim Zimmons from Trout Unlimited stated he has been a resident since 1964. He stated that they have fished the Dwaas Kill and he represents the local chapter and conservation group. Mr. Zimmons stated the organization has invested \$17 billion dollars nationwide and \$12,000 locally with about 10,000 man hours. He stated that the overall opinion based on what they have seen nationally is that they would like to see this in another location away from the water. He stated that concrete is acidic and has chemicals which are a concern. Mr. Zimmons stated that Albany County saw issues with a plant and won a lawsuit to remediate the damages that were done. He stated that recommendations were submitted on behalf of Trout Unlimited; he listed them and stated they are in the applications file as well. Mr. Zimmons stated the real concerns are for the site and the recommendations provided will help the watershed.

**Public Comments:**

No public comment since the project was not considered for a public hearing at the current time.

**Planning Board Review:**

Mr. Fantini stated he would like to speak to an email sent to the Town that was marked as spam. Mr. Scavo stated that they had received the email and it was forwarded to the Board. He stated Town Staff check spam folders and it was retrieved.

Ms. Bagramian asked where the nearest water connection is. Mr. Vuillaume responded that the project will use a well, but noted that the well could be relocated to the opposite side of the site if the Board prefers.

Mr. Fantini stated that he visited the Wilton site and it seemed to be dusty. Mr. Clemente apologized and stated that the project will be constructed with measures to reduce and eliminate dust. He explained that they plan to use a sweeper and hose down truck areas, especially on dry days or when there is little precipitation. Mr. Fantini asked how the applicant has protected other sites so that what happened in Albany does not happen again or at this location. Mr. Clemente stated that the incident in Albany was a mining operation that does not exist here and has completely different operations for mining production of cement material. He stated that they only take the product to mix and deliver and there is no cement production.

Mr. Martin asked how far the silo is located from the center line of the Dwaas Kill. Mr. Vuillaume stated it is about 230'-240' away. Mr. Martin asked what size particles are the vacuum bags designed to remove. Mr. Clemente stated he does not know the micrometer off hand but 99% of the particles are removed. Mr. Martin asked if Mr. Clemente could provide a sworn testimony to this. Mr. Clemente stated he is not an engineer but the data sheets can be submitted. Mr. Martin asked what the SEQRA classification was for the application. Mr. Scavo stated it is currently an Unlisted action but it could be opened up to a Type I if the Board determines that is appropriate for this project. Mr. Martin asked how the applicant would make the best effort to remove the dust from trucks. Mr. Clemente stated there would be water on the truck and they would go through a wash area to remove debris from the truck and this would be

done on a slab and run into collection pits. He stated it is a DOT violation to have debris that could impact the roadway. Mr. Martin asked if Mr. Zimmons's opinion is based on the national experience of the organization and if there is a bibliography that could be provided. Mr. Zimmons stated the regional rep can be contacted and he can try to follow up with more written documentation and information. Mr. Martin asked if there was spawning here and if the dust and particulates could inhibit this. Mr. Zimmons stated it could impact the spawning; the trout are looking for gravel areas to spawn. Mr. Martin expressed concern that the application implicated too many and various environmental risks to the Dwaas Kill, the aquifer, and other surrounding areas. He noted, and specifically identified and called out for the record each and every email received from the public to date and noted that the input from reviewing committees, i.e., Environmental Conservation Committee, echoes similar environmental concerns. Mr. Martin then stated that the various direct, indirect cumulative impacts are too significant for him to support the project at this location.

Ms. Bagramian asked if there would be crusher run for the driveway. Mr. Clemente stated he is going to leave it as gravel for now but he is open to feedback. Ms. Bagramian stated she would like to see a misting system similar to the Route 146 landscape property. Mr. Clemente stated he is able to change the plans to protect the area and he understands the concerns with the Dwaas Kill and will be honoring regulations and will try to move further from the protected water body.

Mr. Fantini stated he agrees with Mr. Martin's comments. He asked what can be done about the porous surface of the gravel driveway and how to mitigate the fuel on site as there can be leaks. Mr. Clemente stated that the fuel tank will be installed above ground, will have a capacity greater than the amount of fuel it will hold, and will be inspected daily.

Ms. Bagramian stated she would like a cut sheet for the fuel tank. Mr. Vuillaume stated they can provide this and look into a double layer tank.

Mr. Fantini asked if they have any measurements for noise and vibrations. Mr. Vuillaume stated they can do this on a similar site and get the measurements.

Ms. Fariello asked where the water from the wash out tank goes. Mr. Clemente stated there are 3 bays and the first 2 settle large particles and the third bay would be reused water for mixing the concrete. He stated that the sediment is recycled as well back into the concrete.

Mr. Fantini stated that the Friends of Open Space had requested an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and asked whether one would be prepared. Mr. Vuillaume responded that they are not conducting a formal EIS, but are following similar procedures. Mr. Andarawis asked if the plant is subject to emissions regulations and is there constant monitoring of the site. Mr. Clemente stated there is no regulations for emissions but they do have to prove there is a bag house filtration system and that it is working properly. Mr. Andarawis stated that any emissions would have high pH levels and they need to protect the waterway so continuous monitoring is

necessary. Mr. Clemente stated they do daily inspections and this includes monitoring and inspection of the equipment. Mr. Andarawis asked whether the Town would need to serve as the regulatory agency for the project. If not, he inquired whether oversight would fall under the jurisdiction of the DEC or be governed by the Clean Air Act.

Mr. Martin asked whether the applicant would be willing to conduct a fishery study specifically including macro invertebrates to monitor the site. Mr. Zimmons responded that the DEC would initially perform electrofishing and continue on a scheduled basis to assess potential impacts. He recommended consulting the DEC office in Warrensburg. Mr. Scavo added that they have previously worked with that office and offered to reach out. Mr. Martin stated that conducting such a study would further benefit the site and emphasized the importance of increasing the buffer zone, ensuring it is robust and well-maintained, and implementing ongoing monitoring of both the stream and the site.

Mr. Ophardt suggest the applicant review their proposed design. He pointed out that the applicant is attempting to screen the proposed 70-foot-tall concrete batch plant behind an old existing house and pole barn. He added, given the concrete batch plants proposed proximity to the Dwasskill Creek, the applicant may be better served moving it out from behind the existing buildings and closer to US Route 9. Mr. Clemente state they can investigate this suggestion and asked if there was a certain distance in mind. Mr. Vuillaume stated they will reevaluate their current design and remove the existing house and pole barn.

Ms. Fariello asked how many employees would be on site. Mr. Clemente stated there would be 2-3 plus truck drivers a manager, yardman and quality control and managerial personnel would be in and out.

Mr. Fantini stated there was a missed email and the public should have the opportunity to speak before and after an application is heard. Ms. Bagramian stated the email was not missed and was mitigated by staff retrieving the email from checking of the Town's spam filter. She stated that emails are encouraged and are reviewed.

Ms. Bagramian asked whether the Board would like to pursue an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project. Mr. Fantini stated that he supports conducting a full EIS. Mr. Martin agreed there are legitimate environmental concerns, emphasizing that a comprehensive EIS should be completed. Mr. Martin stated typically EIS's cover multiple layers of environmental concerns and they have been done for decades so the process is nothing new. In response, Mr. Vuillaume noted that a full EIS process can take years, but stated that he can provide all relevant documentation without formally initiating an EIS. Mr. Martin again requested an EIS. Ms. Fariello stated that the environmental review documents submitted so far are sufficient for her. Ms. Bagramian agreed and suggested reviewing whether any additional environmental documents or specific issues that are missing, that the Board would like to see. Mr. Martin stated there are legitimate concerns so the EIS should be followed. Mr. Ophardt

9/9/25

asked why Mr. Martin wants to push for an EIS. Mr. Martin stated it covers multiple layers of environmental concerns and has been done for years so it is not new. Mr. Andarawis stated he agrees with the complexity of the concerns but does not want the applicant to do a EIS before the Board addresses other concerns as well and they may not even get to that point of the process. He stated that he wouldn't want to ask the applicant to start a time consuming and expensive process if there are fundamental issues that can't be addressed. He suggested that another meeting might be useful ahead of asking for an EIS. Mr. Martin stated there were concerns before tonight and 2 Board members are asking for a EIS so he thinks it should be done. Ms. Fariello stated she is not in favor of an EIS. Mr. Martin stated if the EIS shows that impacts of this application can be mitigated then he would presumably be for the project. Ms. Bagramian recommended tabling the motion for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to give the applicant time to revisit the proposal and make necessary adjustments. Both Mr. Vuillaume and Mr. Martin agreed with this approach.

Mr. Martin moved, second by Ms. Fariello, to table the motion to require the applicant to complete an EIS. 6 ayes, 1 no, Mr. Fantini.

**New Business:**

**#2025-038 Wood Rd Soccer Parking Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)**

SBL: 250.-2-1.1 Applicant proposes a parking Expansion to Previously Approved Site Plan, Wood Rd Zoned: L2 - Light Industrial 2 Status: Concept - Amendment Applicant: S. Jones, Consultant: EDP – J. Dannible

**Consultant/Applicant Presentation:**

Mr. Vuillaume stated he is here tonight to amend an existing parking lot for a soccer field. He stated he is looking to land bank them in case they are needed in the future. He stated he is looking for 26 additional spaces which is an increase from 16.

**Staff and Professional Comments:**

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

**Public Comments:**

No public comment.

**Planning Board Review:**

Ms. Bagramian stated that she does not support piecemeal development and prefers projects to be presented comprehensively. Mr. Fantini stated that he is bringing up an issue for the last agenda item and note that Roberts Rule was not followed to postpone the prior to motion to table

9/9/25

a vote to provide an EIS. Mr. Scavo stated that New York State does not require Planning Boards to follow Robert's Rules of Order. He noted that this information is regularly included in annual training provided to Planning and Zoning Board members.

Ms. Bagramian asked if there is more parking, more lighting is required right? Mr. Vuillaume stated more lighting is not on the plan or proposed. Mr. Martin asked whether there has been recent informal communication between the applicant and the neighbors in close proximity since, in the past, representatives of the applicant had indicated there was some mutual animosity. Mr. Vuillaume stated he is unable to address this issue

Mr. Ophardt asked whether the parking lot would be graveled or paved. Mr. Vuillaume responded that it will remain as dirt for now, which would allow legal parking if needed. He added that the applicant prefers to leave it as-is but is willing to make changes if necessary. Mr. Ophardt also noted that he recalls one light from the site shining toward neighboring properties. Mr. Fantini stated cars can leak oil or gas onto the unpaved areas.

Ms. Fariello stated she prefers to see gravel and not grass parking.

Mr. Andarawis asked if there are more classes coming or if he applicant is just shortening times. Mr. Vuillaume stated he is tightening times between the sessions not adding additional people to each session.

**Discussion Items:**

None

**Public Privilege:**

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

Christine Matthews, 5 Cinnamon Lane stated she is within 2 miles of the proposed cement plant and she has concerns about the air quality off Farm to Market Road. She has spoken to the Town of Halfmoon and she recommends the Board tour the facilities. She stated she has concerns with the increase of truck traffic on Route 9 as well and feels a study should be done.

Tiffany Waligura, Bay Hill Court asked if the zoning was right for a concrete plant due to the noise and the traffic. She stated she has concerns about this as well as the environmental impacts. She stated it is prohibited in the LI zoning and she feels it is a danger to the public and wildlife. Ms. Bagramian stated there is no manufacturing here but this can be reflected back to the Zoning Officer.

9/9/25

Melanie Stracuzzi stated she has concerns with the containment of the solar site with fencing. She stated there have been studies on impacts ten years after they are installed.

Jeff Varecka, 48 Blue Spruce Lane stated he echoes the zoning concerns that have been brought up. He stated that the cement's main component will impact the area and the LI zone focuses on the noxious fumes and particulates. He stated the Board members have seen it and stated that the application is not always real life and what happens for cleanup and he would like an environmental study done.

Eve Bucwinski, 1067 Ballston Lake Road stated she sees a proposed solar every day on her drive, she stated that the Boy Scouts and the Elks are in the area and they shouldn't have to see this either. She stated she has concerns about the zoning here as the solar will be in a residential and farming area. She stated she would be ok with more housing over the solar and deer and turkeys run through the area and asked what would happen to them. Ms. Bucwinski stated she is speaking on behalf of the neighbors as well and stated she likes the open land.

Anthony LaFleche, 21 Wheeler Drive, asked if solar SUP could be denied without recourse. Ms. Bagramian stated the Board has to rationale the denial. Mr. LaFleche asked that if the application is approved the berm could be the entire length of MacElroy this would be on top of the buffer and vegetation. Ms. Bagramian stated they have a lot of work and have to flush things out still. Mr. LaFleche asked that enough room is left to have a bike path. Mr. LaFleche asked if the cement project on Route 9 is solely in Clifton Park. Mr. Scavo stated there is access to Halfmoon and they coordinated with them and waiting to hear outcomes before they make a decision.

Madeline Stark, 9 Cypress Point stated she has concerns with the cement plant and that fact that the application title is not disclosing this. Ms. Bagramian stated that applications use addresses for filing. Ms. Stark stated she has concerns on the dust and stated research shows examples of residential homes and cars getting covered with the dust and people would breathe this and it would get into water ways. She asked if this was a good location with residential across the way.

Raymond Seymour, 7 Nadler Road stated he has submitted written comments on the amount of water the applicant wants to draw from the aquifer per day and stated the soils are different here than in Halfmoon. He stated it doesn't refill as we well and there is not adequate recharge so depressions will occur and create sinkholes. He stated municipal water is about ¼ mile away and he is surprised that the found sewer when it has been there for years and they did not know about it. He stated this is a constrained parcel and this application does not fit well in the area.

James Harris, 28 Twilight Drive stated he has come in with concerns on the Route 9 project and he thinks it deserves an EIS as well. He stated there are traffic concerns and the Traffic Committee has not reviewed this yet and feels they need to be able to before a decision is made.

Michael Murphy, 686 MacElroy Road stated his property would be affected the most by the proposed solar farm and that the parcel as farmland is great for wildlife and if it is taken away

9/9/25

the animals can leave as well. He stated the buffer would still show the entire field from the second floor of his home and there is no water access in case of an emergency. Mr. Murphy stated fencing room for wildlife including deer has not yet been addressed and there are no fire accesses. He asked about water runoff and it impacting his property as well.

Amanda Trent, 23 Spice Mill Blvd stated she is generally in Old Dater Farm and is a retired Shen teacher with a cancer diagnosis. She stated that over the past years there has been an increase of neighbors with cancer and it makes her wonder if something is going on around them and due to this she feels the cement plant does not belong near residential areas.

Jason Moyer, 54 Spice Mill Blvd stated he will be sending an email with more detail but he does not feel the cement plant belongs in this location. He asked what the dust contains and stated he has read it contains a carcinogenic and this can cause health concerns including cancer. He stated the water use volume is a concern for the waterways and asked for oversight from EIS and SEQRA.

Daniel Mathias, 7 Birch Hill Road stated the EIS give informed decision making, it explores alternative, and helps identify mitigation measures to assist the applicant and Board as well as other factors. He asked the Board to consider the EIS for the project and its benefits.

Andrew Runkel, 65 Hollow Drive stated he appreciates the process for the cement plant. He asked that they consider the potential sources of the dust and pollutants. He stated he is not opposed to the project he would just like the intent met.

Mr. Martin moved, seconded by Ms. Fariello, adjournment of the meeting at 10:10 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on September 23, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

*Paula Cooper*

Paula Cooper, Secretary

**ATTACHED:**

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

## Review Comments by Permit#

Permit Number: SUP25-000010

File#	Permit#	Project Name	Route Name	Activity Type	Reviewer	Completion Date	Comment
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006 670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	07/28/2025	The duplex units have been reduced in size and orientated with a side loaded garage for one of the buildings on each structure.
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006 670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	07/28/2025	Applicants must specify whether tree plantings are existing or proposed. For proposed trees, include a planting plan schedule and standard detail.
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006 670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	07/28/2025	The revised configuration of Lot 2 results in a rear yard orientation that enhances green space and increases the southern side yard setback from the neighboring wetland.
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006 670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	07/28/2025	The final site plan should display assigned 911 addresses for each lot/unit.
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006 670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	07/28/2025	The Planning Board must render a decision based on 62 days since the public hearing and the applicant's written consent to extend the time frame for one additional day for consideration at the August Planning Board Meeting.
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006 670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	SEQR Review	John Scavo	07/28/2025	SEQR process completed at the June 2025 Planning Board Meeting.
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006 670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	Fire Marshall Plans Review	John DeSimone	08/06/2025	No concerns at this time

25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	Postal Verification	John DeSimone	08/06/2025	Reference and follow approved postal verification located in documents section
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	SUP Review	Scott Reese	08/06/2025	This Special Use is permitted per Town Code 208-10 B. (10)(a)[7] identifies a Dwelling, two-family and/or semidetached as a special use pursuant to chapter 208-79. The proposed land areas meet or exceeds the minimum area requirement.
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	08/06/2025	The two proposed duplex's meet all space and bulk standards per Town Code.
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	08/06/2025	Per Town Code Chapter 208-79 A. (1) this Special Use Permit requires special consideration so that the (proposed duplexes) are properly located and planned with respect to the objectives of the chapter and the (proposed duplexes) effect on the surrounding properties and community character.
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	08/06/2025	Verify if the Request to Continue Coverage (RCC) form was submitted for this project. It appears that the DEC does not have the RCC for this project. Therefore, a new NOI will need to be submitted to have coverage under GP-0-25-001.
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	08/06/2025	The applicant shall show the location of the foundation footing of the duplex on Lot 1 so its not within the utility easement.
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	08/06/2025	Update the grading plans as the building rotation changed on lot #2.
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	08/06/2025	The proposed site plan shows very little usable outdoor space for duplex homes. Lot 1 is constrained by a utility easement. Lot 2 is constrained by the Federal Wetland delineation. The ECC strongly

		Dwelling SUP					recommends that this project be reduced to single family homes or a single duplex by combining lots 1 and 2.
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006 670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	08/06/2025	The ECC notes the change from single family to duplex homes increases traffic in this vicinity and produces a higher density unsuitable for this busy corner.
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006 670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	08/06/2025	The ECC notes that while there is a small area of usable land it will still need to be maintained, and equipment used to do this may have ramifications on the wetlands it borders.
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006 670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	08/06/2025	The applicant shall show a grading plan so it shows that there will be no impact to the ACOE Wetlands. The ECC notes that the topography slopes downhill from Plank Road into the wetlands. Therefore, any runoff must navigate around the two building structures as well as at least one driveway. It is imperative that the applicant demonstrate how the grading plan will accommodate this runoff to protect the ACOE Wetlands (and the building foundations).
25-000140	SUP25-000010	#2025-006 670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	08/06/2025	The ECC notes that there is no test pit data indicating the seasonal high ground water level adjacent to the wetlands. Per Town Building Code the foundation is required to be two feet higher than the seasonal high ground water level.

## Review Comments by Permit#

Permit Number: SOL25-000002

File#	Permit#	Project Name	Route Name	Activity Type	Reviewer	Completion Date	Comment
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Postal Verification	John DeSimone	08/25/2025	Please use Postal number 700 for postal address. (See approved postal verifications in documents)
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Postal Verification	John DeSimone	08/25/2025	Town fire marshal will advise Saratoga County Emergency Services of new postal address.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Fire Marshall Plans Review	John DeSimone	08/25/2025	Fire access road is compliant with all NYS Fire Codes and exceptions. A fire access road inspection will be completed prior to issuing a compliance certificate.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Fire Marshall Plans Review	John DeSimone	08/25/2025	A knox box or lock will be required. Please reach out to the Jonesville Fire Department (see knox box form in documents)
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Fire Marshall Plans Review	John DeSimone	08/25/2025	Town Fire Marshal will verify new postal address with Saratoga County Emergency Services. (after final planning approval)
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	SEQR Review	John Scavo	09/04/2025	The Planning Board has established lead agency status for the SEQR review process. NYS DEC, during the lead agency coordination establishment process, provided a letter dated July 29, 2025 which has been included within the project and is available for review. Key points within the letter include: - DEC agrees with the Clifton Park Planning Board serving as the SEQR Lead Agency for the project. - Portions of

							<p>the project site may contain NYS-regulated freshwater wetlands and adjacent areas. - A Parcel Jurisdictional Determination (Parcel JD) must be requested to confirm the presence of regulated wetlands. - If wetlands are present, a Project JD may be required to assess whether proposed activities need an Article 24 permit. - If disturbance is unavoidable, a Freshwater Wetlands Permit application must be submitted, including justification, alternatives, and impact minimization. - GIS review indicates part of the site lies within an archeologically sensitive area; therefore, consultation with NYS OPRHP is recommended to assess potential impacts on historic and archeological resources. - If soil disturbance exceeds one acre, the project sponsor must obtain coverage under the SPDES General Permit for Construction Activity. - A Class C stream crosses the site (doesn't appear to be in the proposed area of disturbance for the project). If navigable, any disturbance below mean high water may require an Article 15 Protection of Waters permit. - Section 401 Water Quality Certification: If the project impacts federally regulated wetlands or waterbodies requiring a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from DEC may be necessary.</p>
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	SEQR Review	John Scavo	09/04/2025	<p>In a letter dated May 29, 2025 from NYS DEC that is included in the project file, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) has issued a positive jurisdictional determination for Parcel 264.-3-5.1, confirming the presence of regulated freshwater wetlands and adjacent areas within the proposed project site. Specifically, the parcel includes portions of Wetland R-22, classified as a Class 3 wetland due to its contiguity with fresh surface waters of Class C. This determination triggers the requirement for a freshwater wetlands permit prior to any regulated activity within the wetland or its adjacent area. Additionally, a formal delineation is necessary to establish the precise boundaries of jurisdictional wetlands on the site. The DEC's jurisdictional finding remains valid through May 27, 2030 and underscores the need for coordination with the appropriate DEC regional office to ensure full compliance with Article 24 of the Environmental Conservation Law. This determination does not exempt the</p>

							applicant from obtaining other required local, state, or federal approvals.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	SEQR Review	John Scavo	09/04/2025	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service issued an IPAC official species list dated July 1, 2025 in a letter also included in the project file. One federally listed species that may occur in or be affected by the project area was noted to be the Monarch Butterfly which is a proposed threatened species. The letter also notes that designated critical habitat overlaps the project site. It should be highlighted that while no formal consultation is triggered unless there is a federal nexus (e.g., federal funding or permitting), project proponents are encouraged to evaluate and mitigate potential impacts. This information reinforces the need for the project to incorporate a wildflower mix that will provide a suitable sustaining habit for nectaring species and milkweed plants. Conservation-oriented site design (e.g., pollinator-friendly buffers) should also be evaluated for consideration
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	SEQR Review	John Scavo	09/04/2025	The project area is underlain by surficial lake sands that form part of the Colonie aquifer—a critical groundwater resource for Clifton Park and surrounding communities. Aerial imaging and hydrogeologic mapping indicate that this portion of the aquifer exhibits a shallow water table, increasing its vulnerability to surface disturbances and potential contamination. The surficial lake sands that form the Colonie Aquifer are typically highly permeable, allowing rapid infiltration of surface runoff. The environmental assessment therefore should focus an area of review on the stormwater infiltration analysis and design solution provided by the applicant's professional engineer with review and comments offered by Town Staff, MJ Engineering, and Planning Board Members.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	09/04/2025	A letter submitted to the Planning Staff on September 2nd from an adjacent property owner, Mr. Paul Unter has been included in the project file for consideration, a summary of his concerns are: Notification Issue: Paul Unter, an adjoining property owner, states he was not properly notified about the project, despite being entitled to such notice (Note: the project is in concept and the 500' notification requirement that an application has been filed must be documented at the time of preliminary plan submittal). Project Opposition: He opposes the proposed 5 MWac community solar installation, arguing it would: o

							Shift the area's character from rural residential to industrial. o Devalue neighboring properties. o Be an inappropriate use for land zoned Conservation Residential (CR). Preferred Development: Unter suggests residential development, such as a subdivision, would be more suitable and beneficial for the community. Community Impact: He emphasizes that no one would want to live next to a solar farm and urges the town board to consider how they would feel in the same situation. Personal Stake: Unter has deep ties to the area, owning a 23-acre adjoining property, multiple commercial buildings, townhomes, and a residence nearby. He's been a Clifton Park resident for 37 years. Appeal to Town Board: He calls on the board to protect the town's rural character and uphold the rights of existing landowners by rejecting the proposal.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	09/04/2025	A public hearing will be scheduled once a preliminary plan application and all supporting documentation have been submitted, enabling completion of the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) process. SEQR must be finalized before the public hearing can be formally opened.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	09/04/2025	The data sheets for the proposed TSM-DE15H(II) and HY-DH144N8 panels have been submitted by the applicant and included in the project file.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	09/04/2025	The approved postal verification address/911 location is 700 Mac Elroy Road. Please add this assigned address to future plan submittals.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	ECC Review	Scott Reese	09/05/2025	The ECC notes that the wetland located in the southwest corner of the parcel (W02003A & W02004A) the wetlands only have a 50-foot buffer. The ECC requests that the applicant delineate what type of wetlands are contained on this parcel on the plan. With regard to the southwest wetlands if these are DEC jurisdiction then the buffer must be 100 feet.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy	Solar Permit -	ECC Review	Scott Reese	09/05/2025	The ECC reiterates the following comments and requests a response from the applicant: a. The ECC requests the applicant provide information

		Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Revised Concept				regarding grid connectivity and the expected future use of Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS). If this project cannot function without BESS connectivity, the Planning Board should propose deferring this project until such time as the Town Board has determined project standards for BESS facilities. b. The ECC requests that the Planning Board require the applicant to conform to the NYS Department of Ag and Markets "Guidelines for Solar Energy Projects". c. The ECC notes that wetlands of unusual importance are regulated by the NYSDEC. These include wetlands in flood prone areas, wetlands with endangered species habitat and vernal pools. The ECC requests the applicant validate that these features are not present by contacting the NYSDEC. d. The ECC notes that the plans fail to delineate a service road around the perimeter for the panels and the current panels in the northwestern corner do not appear to provide adequate buffer to the wetlands in that section of the parcel.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	ECC Review	Scott Reese	09/05/2025	The ECC requests the applicant to provide visual simulations based upon the initial proposed planting height as depicted on the Landscape Plan.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	SUP Review	Scott Reese	09/08/2025	This Special Use is permitted per Town Code 208-16 D. (3)(a)[22] identifies Tier 2 and Tier 3 solar energy systems, subject to the requirements of Article XIV and Article XVI as a special use pursuant to chapter 208-79. Before granting approval to any special use, the Planning Board shall determine whether the proposed special use will, among other things, satisfy the the considerations listed under 208-79 E. (1) (a-k).
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	09/08/2025	Applicant to provide or refer to location where Note #4 on sheet C-100 wetland information.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	09/08/2025	The proposed orientation of all of the solar panels are perpendicular to the existing contours. The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)

		SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)					guidance concerning the siting of solar panels on slopes, especially those greater than 8%, suggests that panels may implement practices like using gravel diaphragms placed along the slope/contour to reestablish and maintain sheet flow, which addresses specific requirements related to stormwater management (WQv and RRv). The applicant should indicate if there are slopes greater than 8% and if any additional stormwater treatment will be proposed.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	09/08/2025	Show maintenance access surfaces to the proposed stormwater management areas located on the plan. Verify the distances between the proposed solar panels and fence line are appropriate for maintenance equipment to access the back of the site.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	09/08/2025	Provide jurisdictional information for the wetland labeled W02003A.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	09/08/2025	There is a concern that there is only one row of fencing at the wood line. Typically, silt fences are good for 100 feet of sheet flow provide manufactures recommendations for the proposed silt fence.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	09/08/2025	Provide test hole information showing seasonal high water elevations and required separation of the stormwater treatment facilities shall be documented and included in the Stormwater Management Design Report.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	09/08/2025	This application meets Town Code 208-80 C. (2) Space and bulk standards for Tier 3 solar energy systems.
25-000829	SOL25-000002	#2025-028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP &	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	09/08/2025	The plans show two locations for the proposed equipment areas. The applicant should be aware that the Town of Clifton Park has established a 180-day moratorium on Battery Energy Storage Systems Facilities.

		Site Plan (Stryker)					
25- 000829	SOL25- 000002	#2025- 028 MacElroy Rd Solar SUP & Site Plan (Stryker)	Solar Permit - Revised Concept	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	09/08/2025	The applicant is required to address items listed in Town Code 208-80 C. (3) - (15).

## Review Comments by Permit#

Permit Number: SPR25-000035

File#	Permit#	Project Name	Route Name	Activity Type	Reviewer	Completion Date	Comment
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Traffic Review	John Scavo	08/20/2025	As part of the site plan review for the proposed concrete batch mixing facility, the applicant submitted a Traffic Assessment prepared by CME Engineering. The report evaluates anticipated traffic impacts associated with the facility's operations and its compatibility with existing roadway infrastructure. Key findings of the assessment include: The facility is expected to generate approximately 108 daily trips, including 54 inbound and 54 outbound movements. During peak hours, the site will generate 18 trips in the AM peak and 16 trips in the PM peak, which CME concludes will have a negligible impact on surrounding traffic conditions. This is well below the 100 peak hour vehicle trips threshold accepted by the transportation engineering section to determine whether a proposed project warrants a further detailed traffic impact study (TIS). This is also consistent with SEQR guidance provided by NYS DEC in its Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) Workbook, regarding evaluating FEAF Part II, Question 13- Impact on Transportation which notes that - Part 1, Question D.2.j. in this workbook includes a table defining thresholds for significant traffic increases. That table uses the number of new vehicle trips made during peak traffic hours (early morning and late afternoon) to help determine if a substantial increase in traffic is likely to occur as a result of a proposed activity. It assumes that a project generating fewer than 100 peak hour vehicle trips per hour will not result in any significant increases in traffic. The anticipated traffic volumes for the Clifton Park Batch Plant are also well below the 50-vehicle threshold outlined by ITE, indicating that detailed intersection analysis is not needed and that the site generated traffic will be accommodated by the existing roadway network. The peak hour assumptions are based on similar operations to the existing

							Wilton Bonded Concrete plant which the applicant at the prior two meetings offered to provide tours of the facility to which the Town's Stormwater Management Administrator toured. The sight distance assessment indicates that adequate intersection and stopping sight distance is provided for a passenger car at the Site Driveway on US Route 9 as long as vegetation and a tree located north of the driveway along the property frontage are removed. The available intersection sight distance for a combination truck exiting the Site Driveway looking left and right to make a left and/or right turn is less than AASHTO guidelines due to existing horizontal curves on US Route 9. A review of the NYS Supplement indicates that the installation of "Intersection Warning" signs is not needed. CME Traffic Engineers recommended that any site signing be placed a minimum of 40-feet back from the travel way (outside the sight triangle due to the horizontal curve) and that the landscaping plan consider sight lines in order to maintain visibility at the Site Driveway. The applicant's representative at the Planning Board Meeting should review with the Planning Board how the landscaping and vegetation north of the driveway with a tree also identified are to be removed in accordance with the recommendation above from
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Postal Verification	John DeSimone	08/26/2025	If parcel remains one parcel like plans show, existing address will cover this project. 1910 NYS Route 9 Clifton Park, NY 12065
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Fire Marshall Plans Review	John DeSimone	08/29/2025	Knox box will be required (info will be supplied with building permit)
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Fire Marshall Plans Review	John DeSimone	08/29/2025	Due to no water supply on site if sprinkler fire protection is required Exception 507.2 will be required of the 2020 NYSFC.

25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Fire Marshall Plans Review	John DeSimone	08/29/2025	Will there be vehicles/trucks stored on site after business hours? If yes, please provide detail. (quantity and location)
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	SEQR Review	John Scavo	09/05/2025	The applicant has submitted a comprehensive stormwater management narrative prepared by Environmental Design Partnership, LLP, detailing the proposed stormwater design for the redevelopment of 1910 Route 9. The project involves approximately 3.6 acres of disturbance and an increase of 1.47 acres in impervious surface area. The site is located adjacent to the Dwaas Kill, a Class A Trout Stream and 303(d) impaired water body, and therefore requires careful attention to water quality and hydrologic impacts.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	SEQR Review	John Scavo	09/05/2025	As part of the Planning Board's continued review of the proposed concrete batch mixing facility, I would like to reiterate and emphasize information previously provided by the applicant regarding air quality and dust control measures. The applicant has stated that aggregate materials used in the concrete mixing process are fully contained within the building, and that the mixing operation itself is conducted entirely indoors within a controlled environment and the similar Wilton facility owned by the applicant is a real example given. This design significantly reduces the potential for airborne dust and particulate emissions, which are often a concern with outdoor or partially enclosed operations. Given the self-contained nature of the facility, dust generation is not anticipated to be an issue, and the applicant has indicated that appropriate air quality measures are in place to ensure compliance with applicable environmental standards. These include internal ventilation and dust suppression systems designed to capture and control any residual emissions within the structure. Staff recommends that the applicant's representative reaffirm these operational details during the Planning Board meeting and provide clarification, if needed, on how the building's design and internal systems

							will continue to mitigate air quality impacts throughout the life of the facility.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	09/05/2025	The ECC notes that this project is adjacent to the Dwaas Kill, a Class A trout stream, a C(T) stream and a 303D protected water way. The fishery contains both native and stocked brook trout. The town and it's residents have a significant investment in the quality and the protection of this waterway (Dwaas Kill Nature Preserve). The proposed plant is located within approximately 150 feet of this important environmental resource. Concrete plants present several risks including but are not limited to air and water pollution as well as dust exposure. Given the proximity of the concrete plant to the Dwaas Kill the ECC is concerned about potential adverse environmental impacts.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	09/05/2025	Per Town Code Chapter 208-64 B. (1), "Assembling/fabrication, processing or light manufacturing of products, provided that such activity is not violative of the district regulations as set forth herein, and further provided that such activity does not result in any noxious noise or odor outside the district and does not have a deleterious effect on the air or water quality." The key characteristics of Light Industrial results in minimal environmental impacts of noise, dust, and vibrations. The ECC requests that the applicant demonstrate that this application will conform to the performance standards of the Town Code specifically to the noise and vibration levels by providing measurement of noise and vibration levels.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	09/05/2025	The ECC requests the applicant provide information on the impact to the ground water quality as trout in the Dwaas Kill are very sensitive to PH and all water quality changes. This project utilizes a gravel access road is porous in nature and therefore will be difficult to control pH changes to the groundwater and other potential contamination.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	09/05/2025	The ECC notes that the project will utilize 10,000 gallons of ground water per day from a private well situated directly adjacent to the 100-foot from the Dwaas Kill. The ECC is concerned of the potential that this well will lower the water table and create a "Cone of

							Depression" thereby impacting the recharge of the Dwaas Kill.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	09/05/2025	The applicant has indicated that they will tap into the Colonie Channel Aquifer. It is noted that the northern portion of this aquifer is less productive than other high-yield production locations. The Planning Board should require additional information on the proposed well and pumping station and including completion of this section of the Full EAF. The ECC notes that public water is available in the vicinity of this project. Town Code requires where public water is available that the project be served by the community water system.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	09/05/2025	The applicant plans to install a 10,000-gallon fuel tank on the project site. Please note that this fuel tank will need to be above ground due to the presence of a Primary Aquifer.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	09/05/2025	The ECC notes that the project will utilize an existing private septic system. The potential existing for an overloaded septic system to not properly treat the wastewater. The Planning Board should confirm that no wastewater from the plant operations will enter the septic system and potentially contaminate the ground water. The ECC notes that there is an existing sanitary system on the property.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	09/05/2025	The Planning Department received a written concern from Melissa McNair of Hemlock Drive regarding the proposed site plan for a ready-mix concrete production facility at 1910 Route 9. Ms. McNair expresses strong opposition to the project due to its proximity within 200 feet to the Dwaas Kill Creek, a designated Class A Trout Stream and 303(d) impaired water body. Her letter highlights the ecological sensitivity of the Dwaas Kill, citing its support for brook trout populations and its designation as a protected waterway under New York State DEC classifications. She notes that the proposed industrial use poses risks of siltation, high-pH runoff, and other pollutants associated with concrete production, which could further degrade the creek's water quality and surrounding

							<p>habitat. Ms. McNair also references the Town's prior conservation efforts, including the establishment of the Dwaas Kill Nature Preserve, and urges the Board to uphold those commitments by either rejecting the application or requiring a full environmental impact assessment and greater public transparency. She requests that the project be clearly labeled to reflect its industrial nature so residents can make informed judgments. This correspondence has been added to the project record for consideration during site plan review.</p>
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	09/05/2025	<p>The Planning Department received written correspondence from Theresa Gunderman of Chapel Woods, Ballston Lake, expressing strong opposition to the proposed ready-mix concrete production facility at 1910 Route 9. Ms. Gunderman's concern centers on the project's proximityâ€”within 200 feetâ€”to the Dwaas Kill Creek, a designated Class A Trout Stream and 303(d) impaired water body. Her letter emphasizes the ecological sensitivity of the Dwaas Kill, which supports brook trout populations and serves as a valued natural resource for the community. She notes that concrete production is associated with significant environmental impacts, including greenhouse gas emissions, high-pH runoff, and land disturbanceâ€”all of which pose risks to water quality, aquatic habitat, and nearby residents. Ms. Gunderman references the Town's prior conservation efforts, including the establishment of the Dwaas Kill Nature Preserve, and urges the Board to uphold those commitments by either rejecting the application or requiring a full environmental impact assessment. She also requests that the project be labeled transparently to reflect its industrial nature, allowing residents to make informed decisions.</p>
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	09/05/2025	<p>Section 1.0 of the Stormwater Management Narrative refers to 3.6 acres of disturbance with approximately 1.47 acres of impervious area added to the site. In contrast to Section 4.0 of the Narrative which refers to the area of disturbance will encompass 4.0 acres. In addition, the LEAF dated May 16, 2025 notes a total of 1.80 acres to be physically disturbed.Â Therefore, please clarify the</p>

							acres proposed for disturbance on the 19.373 acre parcel.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	09/05/2025	Please confirm at the meeting that the project's Water Quality Treatment (WQv) design treats 100% of the water quality volume associated with the increased impervious area and 25% of the volume from disturbed existing impervious surfaces, totaling 7,179 cubic feet of treated runoff.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	09/05/2025	Please confirm at the meeting for the public record that the Stormwater Design's Runoff Reduction Volume (RRv) for bioretention basin (SMA #1) is proposed to meet the minimum RRv requirement of 1,217 cubic feet. The basin provides 4,430 cubic feet of reduction capacity, exceeding the minimum threshold.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	09/05/2025	Please confirm at the meeting for the public record that the Stormwater Management Practices include: 1. One bioretention area with sediment forebay and landscaped treatment soils; 2. Two underground infiltration areas; 3. Three hydrodynamic separators for pretreatment
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	09/05/2025	Please confirm at the meeting for the public record that due to presence of high groundwater and clay soils (HSG D), infiltration practices are limited. The proposed design solution incorporates vegetative buffers, minimal clearing, and strategic grading to preserve natural hydrology and avoid wetland impacts.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	09/05/2025	As the qualified design professional, at the Planning Board Meeting, please confirm that the stormwater management system has been engineered to meet NYSDEC permit requirements and mitigate potential impacts to adjacent and downstream properties, including the Dwaas Kill. Also, please confirm that the design reflects best practices for redevelopment in sensitive hydrologic settings and will be subject to continued review during the permitting process.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	09/08/2025	Per Town Code Chapter 208-64 B.(1) Assembling/fabrication, processing is a permitted use. The applicant will need to provide a narrative on how the proposed use will not result in any noxious noise or odor outside the district and does not have a

							deleterious effect on the air or water quality and how the operation will not exceed any of the performance standards per Town Code Chapter 208-64 F. The applicant's engineer shall provide additional technical documentation and quantifiable data to support their response to Town Code Chapter 208-64 F. in the letter to Mr. John Scavo, Jr. dated August 18, 2025. 1. Please provide a noise assessment or acoustic study that includes projected decibel levels at the property line during typical peak operations (e.g., mixer loading, cement delivery). Comparison to ambient noise levels from Route 9 is noted in the response - please support this with measured or modeled data. 2. Please respond on how the proposed project will address 6 NYCRR Parts 200, 201, 211, and 212 regarding air emissions and permitting requirements.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	09/08/2025	The Clifton Park Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) granted an area variance on June 3rd, 2025, from Town Code Chapter 208-65 D. Height. Permitted height of buildings and structures shall be 50 feet. The applicant proposed a 61 feet tall structure (drive thru cement bin). An area variance of 11 feet addition to the permitted height of 50 feet was granted by the ZBA.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	09/09/2025	Identify any containment systems for truck washout or cement spill prevention in the SWPPP.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	09/09/2025	The Stormwater Management Narrative Introduction states that the proposed project will include two underground infiltration areas and three hydrodynamic separators. The narrative also references an expansion of an existing medical building and two existing stormwater management areas. Please update the SWPPP to reflect the current project.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	09/09/2025	Provide test pit data and locations.

25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	09/09/2025	Ready mix concrete has a Standard Industrial Classification Code of 3273 which requires a Multi-Sector General Permit (MSGP) in New York State. The MSGP is required when industrial materials or activities are exposed to precipitation or runoff. The MSGP will require conducting routine inspections and monitoring for Total Suspended Solids, pH, and other pollutants. The SWPPP will also need to be revised to include the specific sources of pollution at the facility and the measures that will be implemented to prevent or control them.
25-000392	SPR25-000035	#2025-017 1910 Route 9 Commercial Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	09/09/2025	This project is a complete change of use from a truck repair facility to a concrete batch plant, coupled with an expansion of the impervious area of over 125%, this project can not be treated under the standard re-development regulations. This project shall be treated as a new development.

## Review Comments by Permit#

Permit Number: SPR25-000034

File#	Permit#	Project Name	Route Name	Activity Type	Reviewer	Completion Date	Comment
25-001330	SPR25-000034	#2025-038 Wood Rd Soccer Parking Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)	Site Plan Review - Amendment	Postal Verification	John DeSimone	08/14/2025	Postal verification was completed 8/24 per the request of the applicant.
25-001330	SPR25-000034	#2025-038 Wood Rd Soccer Parking Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)	Site Plan Review - Amendment	Postal Verification	John DeSimone	08/14/2025	The assigned postal number will be 150 Wood Rd. Please see attached postal verification in documents.
25-001330	SPR25-000034	#2025-038 Wood Rd Soccer Parking Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)	Site Plan Review - Amendment	Fire Marshall Plans Review	John DeSimone	08/14/2025	Does the applicant ever plan having tournaments that will attract large crowds? If so fire lane signs will be required, overflow parking area should be designated, location of temp bathrooms should be shown
25-001330	SPR25-000034	#2025-038 Wood Rd Soccer Parking Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)	Site Plan Review - Amendment	Fire Marshall Plans Review	John DeSimone	08/14/2025	What will the use of the existing pole barn be used for?
25-001330	SPR25-000034	#2025-038 Wood Rd Soccer Parking Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)	Site Plan Review - Amendment	Fire Marshall Plans Review	John DeSimone	08/14/2025	A knox box may be required if the facility plans to have a gate or chain locking access to the facility.
25-001330	SPR25-000034	#2025-038 Wood Rd Soccer Parking	Site Plan Review - Amendment	Fire Marshall Plans Review	John DeSimone	08/14/2025	A building permit may be required if any construction work is performed on existing pole barn or any new structures that may be erected.

		Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)					
25- 001330	SPR25- 000034	#2025-038 Wood Rd Soccer Parking Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)	Site Plan Review - Amendment	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	09/05/2025	The applicant should clarify whether any additional exterior lighting is proposed in conjunction with the parking expansion. Previous concerns raised by neighboring properties and the Village to the north focused on incremental changes to the scope of the project, which increased the size, intensity, and overall scale of the proposed use beyond what was originally presented in the site plan and special use permit application.
25- 001330	SPR25- 000034	#2025-038 Wood Rd Soccer Parking Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)	Site Plan Review - Amendment	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	09/05/2025	The proposed project is subject to Section 239 of General Municipal Law and has been referred to the Saratoga Co. Planning Board for a recommendation.
25- 001330	SPR25- 000034	#2025-038 Wood Rd Soccer Parking Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)	Site Plan Review - Amendment	SEQR Review	John Scavo	09/05/2025	The action when considered cumulatively with the prior approval still appears to be classified as Unlisted and does not meet or exceed the thresholds for a Type I determination.
25- 001330	SPR25- 000034	#2025-038 Wood Rd Soccer Parking Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)	Site Plan Review - Amendment	ECC Review	Scott Reese	09/05/2025	The ECC has no comments at this time.
25- 001330	SPR25- 000034	#2025-038 Wood Rd Soccer Parking Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)	Site Plan Review - Amendment	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	09/08/2025	Site disturbance shall include the land banked parking spaces.
25- 001330	SPR25- 000034	#2025-038 Wood Rd	Site Plan Review -	Zoning Plans	Scott Reese	09/08/2025	This parcel is located in the LI-2 Light Industrial 2 Zoning District. Per Town

		Soccer Parking Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)	Amendment	Review			Code Chapter 208-64 B. (13) Commercial recreation facilities are permitted in the B-5 Corporate Commerce Zoning District. The applicant shall refer to Town Code Chapter 208-94 B. Recreation centers site plan considerations.
25-001330	SPR25-000034	#2025-038 Wood Rd Soccer Parking Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)	Site Plan Review - Amendment	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	09/08/2025	The proposed grass surface for the proposed parking areas does not meet the requirements of Chapter 208-99(6), as grass parking areas are not considered adequately paved to eliminate dust and mud, nor do they provide sufficient drainage provisions as required by the Town Code.