

9/23/25

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 23, 2025

Those present at the September 23, 2025 Planning Board meeting were:

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

Those absent were: D. Bagramian, Chairwoman

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

In the absence of the Chairwoman, Mr. Ophardt assumed the Chairperson responsibilities for the evening's Planning Board Meeting.

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

Mr. Ophardt stated in the absence of Ms. Bagramian, Mr. Luke will be a voting member for the meeting. Furthermore, Mr. Luke has been actively attending Planning Board Meetings and is

9/23/25

fully up to date and familiar with all applications and matters scheduled for consideration this evening.

Minutes Approval:

Mr. Ophardt moved, seconded by Mr. Fantini, approval of the minutes of the August 12, 2025 Planning Board meeting as written. The motion was unanimously carried. Mr. Andarawis and Ms. Fariello abstain.

Public Hearing:

#2025-022 471 Grooms Road Duplex SUP

SBL: 278.-1-45 Applicant proposes construction of a duplex, 471 Grooms RD Zoned: R1 - Residential, Status: Preliminary Applicant: Manny Topsoil and Gravel, Consultant: Advanced Engineering – N. Costa Last Seen On: 05/28/2025

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

Ms. Fariello moved, second by Mr. Luke, to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, an Unlisted action, and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA.

Mr. Ophardt called the public hearing to order at 7:02 p.m. The Secretary read the public notice as published in the Daily Gazette on September 13, 2025.

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Nick Costa stated the application is for a duplex at 471 Grooms Road, the parcel is 0.99 acres and they are proposing access from Grooms Road. He indicated that modifications have been implemented to the entrance, and the building's setback will comply with zoning regulations. He stated utilities are shown and water and sewer will be on site originating from Grooms Road. Mr. Costa stated that the parcel is in the R-1 zone and duplexes are allowed with a Special Use Permit. Mr. Costa stated they have spoken with Saratoga County Public Works and the culvert that was on the site was crushed and nonfunctioning so the applicant removed it and it will be replaced.

9/23/25

Staff and Professional Comments:

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

Public Comments:

Anthony LaFleche, 21 Wheeler Drive stated that regardless of the structure there he would like to see an easement for a possible bike path. He stated this is a good are for the trail to attach to other Town roads. Mr. LaFleche asked if it would be legal to build the structure in wetlands. Mr. Costa stated that the wetlands are non-jurisdictional and the ACOE has sent a letter. Mr. LaFleche asked if the other lots would be built on. Mr. Costa stated not now, they are up for sale but they would also need approvals for building. Mr. LaFleche asked how far back the homes would be from the roadway. Mr. Costa 100' from the centerline and there would be enough for 3 cars in a driveway and 1 in the garage.

Tom Heinz, 30 Esopus Drive, stated he has written a letter to the Board and that this property touches his. He stated construction has already begun and fill has already been added with some tree removal. He stated the applicant should not receive a SUP due to the amount of traffic at the driveway. He stated that wetlands would be impacted and this does not fit into the single family residents that are in the neighborhood. The letter provided by Mr. Heinz has been attached to the file. Mr. Heinz stated that Lapp Road is currently a work road and people drive around traffic on the shoulder to avoid those trying to turn onto it. Mr. Hienz stated he has submitted photos for consideration to show standing water at the proposed driveway. Mr. Fantini asked if the resident thinks the development would help or hurt property values. Mr. Heinz stated that he does not think this one would impact values but developing all 3 may. Mr. Ophardt stated that if the Board approves this application, it will retain discretion to consider future applications for similar Special Use Permit (SUP) requests on the two adjacent lots on a case-by-case basis.

Ram Lalukota, 35 Balsam Way stated he uses the road every day for work and there are lots of traffic problems and feels this would be adding more. He stated he has wetland concerns as well even if they are no jurisdictional.

There being no additional public comment, Ms. Fariello moved, second by Ms. Westrick, to close the public hearing at 7:28 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

Planning Board Review:

Ms. Fariello stated that on May 28 the Board had asked for a traffic study and asked if it had been done. Mr. Costa stated it has not and he does not feel it needs to be done. Ms. Fariello stated the Board asked for a Stage II and III for plans or a full build out. Mr. Costa stated he can show other lots but his client does not own nor is t under contract for the other lots to be purchased, buying is not out of the question though.

9/23/25

Mr. Ophardt expressed his concerns about the developer submitting a proposal for a single duplex when the site could potentially accommodate three duplexes, depending on whether the current wetlands on site are classified as non-jurisdictional wetlands. He expressed his concerns about the site being developed piece-meal rather than as a single project to be evaluated by the Planning Board. Mr. Scavo stated there may be concerns about doing so similar to the concerns in May he raised; even if wetlands are non-jurisdictional, displaced water will go somewhere.

Mr. Martin stated the other 2 lots being developed is a problem and understatement.

Mr. Fantini stated the ECC had commented on a common plan for stormwater. Mr. Costa stated his is a common plan. Mr. Scavo stated if lots 2 and 3 develop it would trigger a SWPPP. Mr. Costa said this isn't segmentation, but total impacts will be considered collectively if more lots are developed.

Ms. Fariello asked how many bedrooms each unit would have. Mr. Costa stated at least 2. Ms. Fariello stated that would be 4 cars or more. Mr. Costa stated this is possible but feels 2 trips would be generated during peak hours.

Mr. Fantini stated he has concerns with the corner of Grooms Road and Lapp Road as it may be one of the worst intersections and feels the overall plan has to be prepared. He stated that a single family home is next to this project as well.

Mr. Ophardt stated his concerns about filling in the wetlands and where the current water on site would drain towards. Mr. Costa said he will check the topography, as it may be trapped water they don't want to move onto neighboring properties. He stated that the water from the pictures taken in May, the water may move now that the culvert has been repaired and replaced. Mr. Ophardt stated that he would like the developer to relocate the proposed driveway as far to the east as practical to avoid any conflicts with the Lapp Road / Grooms Road intersection. Mr. Costa stated they can move it further away from the intersection.

Ms. Fariello asked if the applicant were seeking a single family and not an SUP for a duplex, would the applicant be here. Mr. Scavo stated they would not be before the Planning Board

Mr. Martin asked who would approve of the development if the Planning Board would not see a single family home. Mr. Scavo read from Gary Meyer's letter to the Board. Mr. Martin stated that the application does not look right as there is too much traffic for pull-ins and outs and the busy interstate is close and Lapp Road is worrisome.

Ms. Westrick asked if the applicant would donate frontage for a future bypass lane. Mr. Costa stated he will talk to the applicant about this but there are formalities.

Mr. Andarawis stated that this is a challenging site as it is close to the highway and in a busy area. Mr. Andarawis noted this is a transition zone, so the other two lots will likely change as

9/23/25

well, doubling the Board's concerns. Mr. Ophardt agrees with Mr. Andarawis stated that if not all three lots were duplexes, the potential traffic impact would be less significant.

Ms. Fariello mentioned that as an SUP, the Board has some authority and can require the applicant to relocate the driveway and adhere to a landscape plan. She indicated that, in the case of a single-family residence, the owner has discretion to make decisions as they see fit.

Mr. Ophardt stated that a gas station was once proposed for this site. Due to the high traffic volumes on Grooms Road he did not believe this site would be suitable for single family homes. He stated the site is a part of a transition zone between the Northway and homes further to the west along Grooms Road, and duplexes are a reasonable alternative use.

Mr. Andarawis stated that of any of the three parcels this one would fit the best for a single family home.

Ms. Fariello asked if there was a business across the road as she sees a sign there. Mr. Fantini stated even though there is a sign, it is still residential. Mr. Scavo stated that it does show as a residential parcel. Ms. Fariello asked if the concept plans are still valid from May. Mr. Costa said they made changes based on feedback from the prior meeting.

Mr. Martin stated that the proposed buyer is before the Board tonight and not the actual property owner.

Mr. Andarawis stated the Board typically asks for side load garages and screening for duplexes and it seems as this cannot happen here but they get to protect wetlands so this is challenging. He wants a plan that also includes their usual requests.

Ms. Westrick stated that wetlands are not standing water but ecologically it serves a purpose and is less likely with a duplex than a homeowner to be disturbed. She stated she agrees with Mr. Ophardt that this is a transition area and she would like the Board to consider conditions to protect the land and make it look nice. Mr. Ophardt seconded this comment.

Mr. Ophardt stated if the Board is looking at a duplex then they want landscaping, elevations, and a side load garage. Mr. Costa stated the applicant is looking to build similar to 84 Clamsteam Road. Mr. Ophardt stated this is a good start, but he is not in favor a double front load garage.

Mr. Scavo reminded the Board and the applicant that a decision needs to be made within 62 days.

9/23/25

Old 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 Last Seen On: 09/09/2025

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Joe Dannible stated a site plan was recently approved by the Planning Board with restrictions and there are parking overflow concerns so the applicant has come back with a proposal for 26 additional spaces. He stated that the Board had previously discussed requesting gravel parking, and it is being proposed now, and the applicant will also be able to provide ADA-compliant surfaces.

Staff and Professional Comments:

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

Public Comments:

No public comments.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Fantini asked if the driveway could be changed. Mr. Dannible stated it is not proposed to but they can look at it if the Board requests. Mr. Fantini asked if the applicant was changing the hours of operation and that is the reason for the request. Mr. Dannible stated they are not changing hours but may run 2 sessions at a time instead of 1.

Mr. Ophardt asked if the applicant was extending their hours of operation. Ms. Fariello stated they cannot as they only have daylight to work with.

Mr. Martin asked if the only new parking was from the north to south along the gravel road and asked if they were away from the Sweets and Brewers. Mr. Dannible stated they were away from the Brewers and they added a fence and screening there. Mr. Scavo pulled up a map to show the Sweet's property.

Mr. Ophardt asked if there was access to the Zim Smith trail from the applicant's property. Mr. Dannible stated there is with parking at Mill Road and Round Lake and all other requests have been incorporated.

9/23/25

Mr. Andarawis moved, second by Mr. Fantini, to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, an Unlisted action and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA.

Mr. Martin moved, second by Ms. Fariello, to waive the final hearing for this application for the site plan review of Wood Rd Soccer Parking Expansion Project for a Previously Approved Site Plan, 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.

Conditions:

1. Sign off by Town Staff for ADA compliant parking

Ayes: 7

Noes: 0

The motion is carried.

New Business:

#2025-039 19 Clifton Country Road Flex Business Buildings Site Plan

SBL: 272.-1-44.1 The applicant proposes constructing four flex general business buildings with ancillary garage 19 Clifton Country Rd, Zoned: TC5 - Neighborhood Zone, Status: Concept Applicant: RTM Asset Management Group, LLC, Consultant: EDP – J. Dannible

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Joe Dannible stated the application is in the TC 5 zone in Village Plaza that accommodates Old Brick Furniture and the Hannaford Grocery Store. He stated the application is to the rear of the site with current conditions having speed bumps, utilities, loading docks, is adjacent to Druthers and is an underutilized space. Mr. Dannible stated they are looking to keep the edge of pavement and have 4 buildings with office space and ancillary garage space. He stated this would be space that a tenant could rent the entire building or a portion of it. He stated they are willing to work with the Town on tenant fit ups and are onboard for being compliant. Mr. Dannible stated the buildings would be 48' deep and 100'-140' long. He indicated that a substantial portion of the woodland would be preserved, although certain trees located nearer to the roadway may need to be removed to facilitate the development. Mr. Dannible stated buffers to connector roads would not change and they would be utilizing existing parking areas for modified parking. Mr. Dannible stated public water and sewer would be utilized and they would restripe the parking lot to ass 55 new spaces. He stated he thinks this is an excellent use for the area as people can work and live in the area as well as patronize. Mr. Dannible stated the next step is TAC and is looking for a recommendation tonight.

Mr. Martin recused himself from the application and further hearings.

9/23/25

Staff and Professional Comments:

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

Public Comments:

No public comments.

Planning Board Review:

Ms. Fariello asked where the additional parking would come in. Mr. Dannible stated the current lot would be restriped with that they would gain 55 spaces.

Ms. Westrick asked how increased parking and business would affect cut-through traffic control. Mr. Dannible stated they may keep the speed bumps however, this is a private drive and they will have to find solutions.

Mr. Ophardt asked about the proposed building type, as warehouses are not permitted in this zone. Mr. Dannible stated it would be a single story building with overhead doors to parking and an office space. He stated the general business space similar to behind his own office. Mr. Dannible stated tenants would need to comply with code and Mr. Reese would need to approve them. Mr. Ophardt stated that in the past this area has been known to flood and asked how the applicant is going to mitigate this. Mr. Dannible stated he would have to look at the water and how it runs off the pavement to the area and may look at stormwater management to see if it is sufficient. Mr. Dannible stated that only new impervious surfaces are on the building footprint and have a reservoir underground but he will address this if needed.

Mr. Andarawis stated this is an interesting area to develop he appreciates the trees staying but asked if the foundations are far enough from the existing trees that keep the root healthy. Mr. Dannible indicated that he is able to review this matter; however, the trees are located 35 feet from the property line. He also noted that approximately 20 years ago, a water line was installed in this area, during which time roots were also cut. Mr. Andarawis stated that walkability here is important and asked the applicant to keep a path in mind as the project moves forward. Mr. Dannible stated they will most likely extend the walking path from the Bentley to the roadway.

Mr. Fantini asked what similar building had what uses for them. Mr. Dannible stated a hydrologist, for example, where they use half for office space and half for trucks. He stated farmers may use it for office space. Mr. Dannible stated pre-COVID office space was popular but not now and this is the newest trend.

Mr. Ophardt pointed out the on-site storage of materials in the TC Zone is prohibited. Mr. Dannible stated they are willing to adhere to the Zoning Officer's decision about on-site storage. Mr. Ophardt pointed started a 7500 Sq.Ft. is a large building. Mr. Dannible stated there would

9/23/25

be around 1,200 Sq Ft. of space per building, but they can be flexible. Mr. Ophardt asked about the additional parking spaces being proposed behind the plaza. Mr. Dannible stated there would be an additional 55 spaces added to accommodate the new office spaces. Mr. Ophardt expressed his concern with the applicant's proposal being closely situated near Druthers and 8 Wall Street. He pointed out the applicant will need to address visibility issues with the removal of mature trees, pedestrian access, noise and drainage issues also. Mr. Dannible state that it is an under-utilized space and the applicant will address each of the Planning Board's concerns as these project moves forward.

Ms. Fariello moved, second by Mr. Andarawis to refer the application, to the Town Center Advisory Committee to perfect preliminary a preliminary site plan. All in favor, the motion is passed.

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.

Erica Hancox, 4 Mann Blvd, Halfmoon stated she is here for the concrete plant proposal. She stated that they have been known to pollute area with toxins and these particles can travel distances. She stated she called to get information but there wasn't an opportunity for her to. Ms. Hancox stated she started a petition and has 1,100 responses and has a copy of it to file with the Town Clerk in Clifton Park, Halfmoon, and Ballston Lake. She stated they deserve to live in a community without pollutants and this does not follow the goals of Clifton Park. She stated at the last meeting it was show that prevention is far better than correction and there was a petition in Syracuse and it lead the Board there to deny the application and asked this Board to do the same.

Joanne Coons, 4 Balsam Way stated she had heard about the proposed concrete plant and gets emotional because she use to bring her kids trout fishing and it feels like a lot of industrial is going in near the waterway and it should be looked at closer. Ms. Coons went over the environmental affects this would have on the stream and asked the Board to think about the

9/23/25

entire picture. Mr. Fantini asked if she thought an environmental impact study should be done. Ms. Coons stated she thinks it should.

Tiffany Waligora, Bay Hill Court stated she is here tonight for the cement plant. She stated she has lost hope and does not want to be here. She stated she is not against land rights or development but she needs to advocate for the kids, elderly and the ill as well as those who cannot for themselves due to health risks. Ms. Waligora stated there needs to be a proper public hearing and the SEQRA needs to be reclassified to a Type I action. She went through the Code and asked the Town to review not only their codes but State and Federal as well. She stated ready mix have been linked to cancer and an increase of pH in the water where the trout swim. Mr. Fantini asked if she felt speaking before the meeting would help. Ms. Waligora stated she doesn't mind having to speak after but just wants to be heard.

Medgma Foreshal, 10 Bridgewater Court stated that there is a great community here with mothers that get together and talk a lot about things. She stated she found out about the concrete pant from them and she is in medicine. She stated that she has come up with a list of impacts and how she has spent summers on a farm and why she chose to come back to this community. She stated she has working in most of the Capital Region hospitals and have done her homework. She stated he is a believer in business and a growing community but health is wealth and if a community is not healthy it will dissipate. Ms. Foreshal stated exposure to dust can cause cancer, respiratory conditions and they are already seeing 30-40 year olds with an increased risk of cancer and this is concerning. She stated that they need to protect the children for tier future and for everyone's.

Judy Morley, 8 Gretchen Drive stated she appreciates public feedback but is disappointed the developer has left. She stated the developer rear the Town Center Park and would like to know who this development would affect the park and the residents that utilize it.

Gurinder Garcha, 8 Wall Street stated he lives in the Bentley and stated that to turn left to Clifton Country Road is hard now and this development will increase the traffic there. He stated the YMCA and day care already generate traffic and there are seniors living nearby that utilize the private road and asked the Board to request a traffic study and talk to the Highway Department about the main road and Wall Street. Mr. Ophardt stated the Board hears your concerns as well and will take them into consideration when the applications are heard.

Frank Berlin, 980 Main Street stated he is involved with Open Space and all of the Kills in the area go into each other and they are blessed to have clean waterways. He stated water from the concrete plant will pump about 10,000 gallons per day and the buffer is from the high water mark not from the center of the stream. He stated there are wood turtles in the brooks and they winter under the ice and will be impacted. He stated there is a lot that goes on in the stream that we do not see but will be impacted as this is a sensitive area. He thanked the Board for letting the public speak. Mr. Berlin stated the new application for behind Hannaford causes concerns for the

9/23/25

garages and fuel storage. He stated he agrees with other and there is a concern for traffic in the area and stated it is important for everyone to speak to neighbors so all are informed.

Anthony LaFleche, 21 Wheeler Drive asked where a concrete plant would be allowed in the Town as it seems to be a heavy use not light industrial. Mr. Ophardt stated the Code Enforcer would determine if it meets the use. Mr. LaFleche stated it still seems too close to the Dwaas Kill and in a compact area. Mr. LaFleche stated that a lot of cars drive off the roadway at the corner of Grooms Road and Lapp Road and there needs to be a turning lane there and this could be the way to include one. Mr. LaFleche asked for room for a possible trail as well at the area. Mr. LaFleche asked if the buildings behind Hannaford would be flex space with no asphalt and asked if there could be enough room left for large trucks to access the route and delineate the trails there with stripping. Mr. Ophardt stated common features were shown and the Bard shares concerns for this area.

Barbara Smith, 13 Saxony Way stated she is opposed to the concrete plant and the community needs to be heard. She stated that Bonded Concrete has longevity in the area and the reality of living near plants is a concern. She stated they can tell you what goes on daily. Ms. Smith stated she does not know how to get around the powerful businesses but the health and wellbeing outweighs the business.

Ms. Fariello moved, seconded by Mr. Fantini, adjournment of the meeting at 9:22 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on October 14, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Cooper

Paula Cooper, Secretary

ATTACHED:

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

Review Comments by Permit#

Permit Number: SUP25-000013

File#	Permit#	Project Name	Route Name	Activity Type	Reviewer	Completion Date	Comment
25-000546	SUP25-000013	#2025-022 471 Grooms Road Duplex SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Concept	Open Space, Trails, and Riverfront Advisory Committee	Melinda Acker	08/20/2025	Please provide 15 feet wide right of way for future multipurpose Trail along Groom Road
25-000546	SUP25-000013	#2025-022 471 Grooms Road Duplex SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Concept	Postal Verification	John DeSimone	08/26/2025	Postal verification will be finalized with Saratoga County Emergency Services after final planning approval.
25-000546	SUP25-000013	#2025-022 471 Grooms Road Duplex SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Concept	Fire Marshall Plans Review	John DeSimone	08/26/2025	No concerns at this time
25-000546	SUP25-000013	#2025-022 471 Grooms Road Duplex SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Concept	ECC Review	Scott Reese	09/17/2025	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. No approval shall be granted until determination has been made by the NYSDEC.
25-000546	SUP25-000013	#2025-022 471 Grooms Road Duplex SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Concept	ECC Review	Scott Reese	09/17/2025	The ECC notes that this application has stormwater implications across the three contiguous parcels. The ECC requests that the Planning Department obtain a legal opinion from the Town Attorney to consider this application as a part of a larger common plan and to address the stormwater issues comprehensively.
25-000546	SUP25-000013	#2025-022 471 Grooms Road Duplex SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Concept	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	09/18/2025	The proposed duplex meets all space and bulk standards per Town Code.
25-000546	SUP25-000013	#2025-022 471 Grooms Road Duplex SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Concept	SUP Review	Scott Reese	09/18/2025	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 area exceeds the minimum area requirement.

		Duplex SUP					
25- 000546	SUP25- 000013	#2025- 022 471 Grooms Road Duplex SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Concept	SUP Review	Scott Reese	09/18/2025	In 2018, a proposal was submitted for a three-lot subdivision with duplex units planned for each lot. The application was denied due to site constraints, including setback requirements and the presence of significant delineated wetland areas. However, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) issued a letter dated August 18, 2025, stating: "The proposed work associated with the proposal to discharge fill material into non-jurisdictional wetlands to facilitate the construction of a 3-lot residential development is not a regulated activity under the jurisdiction of this office." While there is no current indication that the applicant is coordinating development with adjacent lot owners, it is within the Planning Board's discretion to determine whether this application constitutes or should be considered part of a larger common plan of development â particularly if the Board opts to revisit the previously denied subdivision in light of the updated ACOE determination. Given that the current application involves the construction of a duplex, should the Planning Board revisit the previously denied three-lot subdivision? If duplex units are proposed on all three lots, there is a strong likelihood that the project would require a full Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), including both water quality and quantity controls.
25- 000546	SUP25- 000013	#2025- 022 471 Grooms Road Duplex SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Concept	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	09/18/2025	This Special Use Permit should consider using erosion and sediment controls to lessen any environmental impacts that this development may have.
25- 000546	SUP25- 000013	#2025- 022 471 Grooms Road Duplex SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Concept	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	09/18/2025	If the Planning Board is considering the to look at this application as part of a larger common plan of the original three lot subdivision then it could trigger the requirement for a Full SWPPP. The applicant can supply a written statement clarifying that this application is not being coordinated with development of the adjacent lots.
25- 000546	SUP25- 000013	#2025- 022 471 Grooms Road Duplex SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Concept	SEQR Review	John Scavo	09/19/2025	As part of the Planning Board's review of the site plan and special use permit applications for the proposed duplex project at 463â471 Grooms Road, I would like to provide clarification regarding the recent jurisdictional determination issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

							<p>(Permit Application No. NAN-2025-00611-ULA). The Army Corps has determined that Wetland A (2.21 acres) located within the project site does not meet the criteria for "Waters of the United States" under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. As a result, the proposed discharge of fill material into this wetland area is not subject to federal regulation and does not require a Department of the Army permit. This determination is valid for five years unless new information arises that warrants a revision. It is important to note, however, that this federal determination does not exempt the applicant from obtaining any other required permits or approvals, including those from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) or the Town of Clifton Park. While the wetlands are not federally regulated, the Planning Board retains full discretion under SEQRA to evaluate potential environmental impacts associated with the project. This includes consideration of stormwater management, habitat protection, buffer zones, and cumulative effects on the surrounding environment. In summary, the Army Corps' determination simplifies the federal permitting process for the applicant but does not diminish the importance of local and state environmental review. The Planning Board should continue to assess the project's environmental implications in accordance with its responsibilities under Town Code and SEQRA.</p>
25-000546	SUP25-000013	#2025-022 471 Grooms Road Duplex SUP	Special Use Permit - Revised Concept	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	09/19/2025	<p>Saratoga County Public Works Work Permit Requirement -Please note that the proposed site plan and special use permit application for the construction of a two-family dwelling adjacent to Grooms Road remains subject to review and approval by the Saratoga County Department of Public Works. As of this writing, the required work permit from Saratoga County has not been obtained. Final stamping of the site plan will not occur until the applicant has secured the necessary work permit and satisfactorily addressed any outstanding concerns or conditions identified by Saratoga County Public Works. Coordination with the County is the responsibility of the applicant, and documentation of permit issuance must be provided prior to final Planning Board endorsement.</p>

Review Comments by Permit#

Permit Number: SPR25-000039

File#	Permit#	Project Name	Route Name	Activity Type	Reviewer	Completion Date	Comment
25-001330	SPR25-000039	#2025-038 Wood Rd Soccer Parking Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)	Site Plan Review - Final	Open Space, Trails, and Riverfront Advisory Committee	Melinda Acker	09/16/2025	Please provide 15 feet wide right of way for future multipurpose Trail along wood Road
25-001330	SPR25-000039	#2025-038 Wood Rd Soccer Parking Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)	Site Plan Review - Final	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	09/18/2025	No further comment.
25-001330	SPR25-000039	#2025-038 Wood Rd Soccer Parking Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)	Site Plan Review - Final	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	09/18/2025	No further comment.
25-001330	SPR25-000039	#2025-038 Wood Rd Soccer Parking Expansion (Previously Approved Site Plan)	Site Plan Review - Final	Open Space Plans Review	Jennifer Viggiani	09/19/2025	Will the accessible parking spaces and access aisles be paved to meet ADA compliance for surface material? It looks like the proposal is all gravel on the current plans, and that surface may not meet the ADA standards. Likewise, will there be an accessible ADA route to the restrooms proposed on site, and access into the restrooms that complies with accessibility design standards? There may be injured players that come to cheer for their team, or family members who are fans that may utilize accessible features.

Review Comments by Permit#

Permit Number: SPR25-000036

File#	Permit#	Project Name	Route Name	Activity Type	Reviewer	Completion Date	Comment
25-001452	SPR25-000036	#2025-039 19 Clifton Country Road Flex Business Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Concept	ECC Review	Scott Reese	09/17/2025	The ECC notes that this project is located in the TC-5 Neighborhood Zone. The definition of this zone is as follows: "The Town Center Neighborhood Zone is intended to be the core pedestrian shopping area and mixed-use neighborhood. A network of side streets with wide sidewalks, street trees and commercial shopfronts served by on-street parking, hidden parking lots and garages tucked within the center of the blocks. Three-story mixed-use buildings, with residential dwelling units only permitted above commercial space. Provides incentives to permit up to five-story buildings in return for providing structured parking." There is not enough space in this area to accommodate any of the above uses in this area given the current utilization by the existing retail establishments. For example, this project would eliminate the vegetated buffer between Druthers and the Hannaford Shopping Center service area. The ECC notes that there was significant discussion about the vegetated buffer between the Druthers project and the Bentley at the time of approval and the Planning Board supported a larger, more robust buffer in approving the project.
25-001452	SPR25-000036	#2025-039 19 Clifton Country Road Flex Business Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Concept	ECC Review	Scott Reese	09/17/2025	This proposed project requires extensive commercial vehicle access which is limited to the current service areas of Hannaford and Old Brick Furniture.
25-001452	SPR25-000036	#2025-039 19 Clifton Country Road Flex Business Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Concept	ECC Review	Scott Reese	09/17/2025	The ECC notes that the TC 5 use strongly advocates pedestrian use and large sidewalks. This project increases traffic and creates potential pedestrian conflicts. Because of the inconsistencies of this project with the goals and objective of the Town Center Plan the ECC recommends rejection by the Planning Board.

25-001452	SPR25-000036	#2025-039 19 Clifton Country Road Flex Business Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Concept	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	09/18/2025	This proposed application is showing the construction of four Flex General Business structures totaling 22,500 +/- square feet. The application is in both the TC5-Neighborhood Zone with the Open Space Zone. Typically flex space structures have been permitted in the Industrial Zones, Corporate Commerce and a few in the business zones. Each use of the potential tenants are verified if their business is compliant with the permitted use that the flex space structures area is located in. In this case the flex space structure is located in the TC5 Zone that permits mostly commercial uses and not warehousing, and small contractors storing their materials. Does the applicant have in mind what business they hope to attract in this location as most permitted uses are more retail store front type of uses?
25-001452	SPR25-000036	#2025-039 19 Clifton Country Road Flex Business Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Concept	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	09/18/2025	This is the second open application from the property owner that is located in the Open Space Zone. Per Town Code Chapter 208-22 3. H. Open Space "The Open Space Zone boundaries are representational of the amount and general location of open space, buffer or amenity area to be set aside from a Master Plan perspective. The actual location, extent, design, level of improvement and management (public, private, nonprofit) shall be determined as part of the design development review for the parcel(s)." I recommend that the plans should show where open space will be designated on this parcel.
25-001452	SPR25-000036	#2025-039 19 Clifton Country Road Flex Business Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Concept	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	09/18/2025	Both of the above comments can be discussed in further detail at the next scheduled TAC meeting.
25-001452	SPR25-000036	#2025-039 19 Clifton Country Road Flex Business Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Concept	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	09/18/2025	The proposed structures are over the existing drainage area that collects runoff from the roof of the existing plaza. During large storm events these areas get flooded. The applicant shall show how this will be addressed in future submittals.

25-001452	SPR25-000036	#2025-039 19 Clifton Country Road Flex Business Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Concept	Open Space Plans Review	Jennifer Viggiani	09/19/2025	Applicant needs to show how this project complies with the Town Center Districts Regulating Plan section 208-22, regarding the layout of a service alley or private road, and also, regarding the layout of public open space concepts that are shown on the Regulating Plan graphic that is embedded in the Town Code https://ecode360.com/attachment/CL1051/CL1051-208%20FBC%20Regulating%20Plan.tif.png
25-001452	SPR25-000036	#2025-039 19 Clifton Country Road Flex Business Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Concept	Open Space Plans Review	Jennifer Viggiani	09/19/2025	The Applicant should refer to the "Future Streets Map" of the Town Center Districts Code, and review this with the Planning Board. It will be key to establish if the proposed new buildings are to be sited along a "service alley" which is arguably, a private road with circulation by public traffic. The definition of this alley or private road is critical to determining building layout, orientation, setbacks and a traffic and pedestrian circulation plan for the site. How can the new buildings' setback be based on setback to a roadway where there is a solid mass of existing buildings to the east? It doesn't make sense. Recommend that the applicant show a roadway along the east side of these proposed buildings that connects to Southside Drive and to Wall Street.
25-001452	SPR25-000036	#2025-039 19 Clifton Country Road Flex Business Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Concept	Open Space Plans Review	Jennifer Viggiani	09/19/2025	Upon establishing what type of street the 4 proposed buildings will be located upon, then the pedestrian circulation can be defined and laid out. NOTABLY, the Future Streets Map of the Town Center Districts code shows a concept for a "future new multi-use path" through this location, as part of future development of the site. This should be discussed directly as part of this project.
25-001452	SPR25-000036	#2025-039 19 Clifton Country Road Flex Business Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Concept	Open Space Plans Review	Jennifer Viggiani	09/19/2025	The Applicant should show more aerial view context of the west side of their 20.82-acre property of the adjacent vicinity which is the Bentley residential living and Druthers restaurant, and the nearby Town Center Park, for the Planning Board to see the context for the new buildings being proposed.
25-001452	SPR25-000036	#2025-039 19 Clifton Country	Site Plan Review - Concept	Open Space Plans Review	Jennifer Viggiani	09/19/2025	This project includes frontage to the north side, along Southside Drive which is identified as "C" a "Park Street" in the Town Center Districts zoning. This project should include a continuation of

		Road Flex Business Buildings Site Plan					concrete sidewalks along the Southside Drive frontage to connect to the sidewalks that end at the adjacent Druthers Restaurant and meet the specifics called for by the design standards for a "park street" in the code.
25- 001452	SPR25- 000036	#2025- 039 19 Clifton Country Road Flex Business Buildings Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Concept	Open Space Plans Review	Jennifer Viggiani	09/19/2025	Likewise, this project includes frontage along Wall Street to the south, and there should be a seamless connection to the existing pedestrian infrastructure in place along Wall Street, a "perimeter street".