

3/24/26

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

PLANNING BOARD

ROCCO FERRARO
Chairman

STEFANIE BITTER
Attorney

PAULA COOPER
Secretary



MEMBERS
Emad Andarawis
Eric Ophardt
Heather Fariello
Denise Bagramian
Keith Martin
Lisa Westrick
Joanne Coons (alt.)

Planning Board Minutes
March 24, 2026

Those present at the March 24, 2026 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board: R. Ferraro, Chairman, E. Andarawis, H. Fariello, E. Ophardt, K. Martin, D. Bagramian, Joanne Coons (alternate)

Those absent were: L. Westrick (arrived late)

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

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

Mr. Ferraro stated that in the absence of Ms. Westrick, Ms. Coons would be a voting member tonight until the arrival of Ms. Westrick.

Minutes Approval:

3/24/26

Ms. Fariello moved, seconded by Mr. Ophardt, approval of the minutes of the March 10, 2026 Planning Board meeting as written. The motion was unanimously carried. Mr. Martin and Ms. Bagramian abstain.

Public Hearing:

#2026-011 Village Plaza II Mixed Use 2 Lot Subdivision

SBL: 272.-1-44.1 Village Plaza Apartments 2 lot subdivision, 19 Clifton Country Rd. Zoned: TC5 - Neighborhood Zone, Status: Preliminary Applicant: RTM Asset Management Group, LLC, Consultant: EDP – J. Dannible

Mr. Ferraro stated that action cannot be taken tonight because the site plan that was approved was for 20 units and the zone only allows 10. He stated that there needs to be approval by the Town Board before action can be taken by the Planning Board. Mr. Scavo explained the process of review by the Town Board.

Mr. Ferraro stated that per Town Code a decision needs to be made within 62 days after the public hearing is closed. He stated that because of the need for the Town Board to review this, the Planning Board is asking the applicant to agree to an extension of the 62 day period if necessary.

Mr. Ferraro 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.

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

Mr. Ferraro called the public hearing to order at 7:10 p.m. The Secretary read the public notice as published in the Daily Gazette on March 14, 2026.

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Joe Dannible stated he is here tonight for a 2 lot subdivision. Mr. Dannible showed the site plan and stated the location is in the parking lot for the Old Brick Furniture building. He stated the applicant has looked at density on the 20 acre parcel and looked at this density now and stated

3/24/26

there are technicalities they have to work through. Mr. Dannible stated the applicant is seeking approval to subdivide off the main parcel, and easements will be provided for ingress, egress and parking as well as maintenance. He stated that maintenance for each parcel will be done by the same company.

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 comment.

There being no public comment, Ms. Coons moved, second by Ms. Bagramian, to close the public hearing at 7:16 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Ferraro asked if a separate parking agreement is necessary. Mr. Scavo stated this would be a part of the reciprocal easements and already in the project file and can be referenced in the final approval. Mr. Miller, property owner, stated that the Village Plaza is about 24 acres and when the 2 outer buildings were subdivided there were 36 units there. He stated the Planning Board at that time did not want them to come back and not consider the prior cumulative impacts of those units with the density of the remaining parcel. Mr. Miller further stated the original master parcel is allowed 50 units and they took out 36 before this application due to the prior apartment building previously subdivided out. He asked the Board if they would allow more than 14 units, is there a way to modify the notation that whatever is agreed on, it shall be balanced with no additional residential units allowed so that they do not need to go to the Town Board or the ZBA again. He stated the current subdivision is being done for financing reasons. Mr. Dannible stated they had done this before with another project. Mr. Scavo stated they can look at the Tallow Wood Project and this Windsor Apartment/Mixed-Use Project for prior determinations and pathways for achieving approval. He stated this decision is up to the Zoning Officer so the applicant may need to talk to Mr. Reese to avoid complications in the future.

Ms. Bitter asked the applicant to review the process of calculating the density. Mr. Dannible explained the formula and its application to all in attendance. Mr. Scavo helped explain the Town Board's determination at the time the density calculations was established and set to a maximum of no parcel having no more than 50 residential units under a project without additional review and approval from the Town Board. Ms. Bitter stated this application should be tabled so Mr. Scavo can consult with Mr. Reese. Mr. Ferraro stated that at the next meeting the Board may be able to take action based on the Zoning Officer's determination. Mr. Dannible asked if the approval can be determined tonight conditioned upon Mr. Reese's approval since

3/24/26

this has been done before in the Town. Ms. Bitter stated it was in staff comments so she would be more comfortable with a decision by Scott Reese first. Board Members agreed that if Mr. Reese signs off in a positive way that they will take action at the next meeting.

Old Business:

#2025-027 Miller Road Flex Space Phase 2 Site Plan

SBL: 270.-2-3.121 Proposed development of 13 buildings for flex space, Rt 146 Zoned: B5 - Corporate Commerce, Status: Revised Preliminary Applicant: Miller Road Storage LLC, Consultant: Advanced Engineering – N. Costa Last Seen On: 10/28/2025

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Nick Costa stated he is the design engineer for the project and is representing the property owner seeking approval for developing Phase II of the project. Mr. Costa stated this application is a continuation of Phase I to provide flex space opportunities. He stated access for Phase II would be from Route 146 and connect to the access from Miller Road via the Phase I project as well. Mr. Costa stated there will be 13 buildings each approximately 6,000 sf. He stated since the last meeting in October there has been a traffic study and a cub cut permit has been obtained from NYS DOT. He stated some changes have been made to the current site plan based on prior Planning Board comments, such as changing parking and adding a picnic area. He stated the applicant has also updated the landscaping plan which includes a fence and bermed frontage.

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:

Jody Genovese, 531 Miller Road, stated she is here tonight with her husband, Frank Genovese and stated they are here tonight with lighting concerns. She stated that she met with Mr. Scavo in 2024 about lighting concerns; she stated that the current Phase I project lights up the inside of her home. She asked what a timeframe would be to resolve this problem. Mr. Ferraro asked where their home is in relation to the application. Ms. Genovese pointed out on the map her home. Mr. Genovese stated they are across the road on Miller Road from the application. Ms. Genovese asked about noise in the property. She stated that she has complained about it and it gets better but then repeats. She stated they come early in the morning and they get woken up by trucks beeping and coming into the property late at night. She stated that a few weeks ago she was disturbed after 9 p.m. by a loud noise and she realized it was a renter from this facility reviving a motorcycle engine. Ms. Genovese asked what can be done as her daily routines are

3/24/26

being disrupted and would like to know what the uses permit. Mr. Genovese stated that he is hesitant to see a picnic table there as it will cause more people to congregate on-site. He stated the vegetation is a problem, and 3 dead trees contribute to the light spilling from the property. Mr. Ferraro asked if Phase I was mitigated with light. Mr. Scavo stated that the lighting needs to be evaluated and mitigated and can be looked at with cumulative impacts under this project's consideration for approvals. Ms. Genovese stated that she has had to buy blinds and feels she cannot open windows anymore and her family has been on this land for 106 years. Mr. Genovese stated a hood on the lights may help with the problem with lights directed down. Mr. Scavo read from his comment about lighting. Mr. Martin stated he was with her concerns for such impacts previously with consideration of Phase I and thanked them for their time. Mr. Martin agreed with the resident stating it is bright with spillage based on his visual observations of the sight at night.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Scavo stated that he believes to move forward the Board should look at the as-built photometric plan of Phase I and include this within the cumulative impacts evaluation under the Phase II review. Mr. Costa stated there was no light spillage shown on the plan.

Ms. Bagramian asked the applicant if he could go back and add lighting mitigation to the plan for Phase I while looking at Phase II. Mr. Costa stated that they will look into this and do what is needed. Ms. Bagramian asked if they could look at the installation of down directional hoods now for existing exterior lighting. Mr. Costa stated he can and the owner wants to be a good neighbor. Mr. Costa stated that the building has the lights and they are not on poles and other buildings can hide them from adjacent residents. He stated he will still go back to the applicant with this.

Mr. Ophardt stated at night, on Route 146, there is a whole row of lights that drivers can see. He asked if something could be done as there are about 12 lights visible from the highway. Mr. Ophardt stated that the buffer so far has been very disappointing since they started 2 years ago.

Mr. Ferraro stated the next step is to mitigate the lighting impacts. Mr. Ferraro stated that there is a different set up built out under Phase I than that represented on the Site Plan. He stated that the footprint is not the same as what was approved. Mr. Costa stated the changes were an approved field change, but he cannot remember who approved it. Mr. Scavo stated he can look at it.

Mr. Martin stated this look at lighting for Phase I and appropriate mitigation for the current built conditions may help with the configuration of lights on Phase II.

Mr. Ferraro stated that before the Board can take action on Phase II, Phase I lighting needs to be addressed, as well as the other site plan discrepancies.

Mr. Andarawis stated that the photometric plan needs reevaluation because if buildings changed, then the lighting may not have been readjusted appropriately.

3/24/26

Ms. Fariello stated the site plan for Phase II needs to be accurate in reflecting Phase I.

Ms. Bagramian stated the Board had also previously spoken about split rail fencing and robust landscaping but she does not see it on the plans. Mr. Costa stated it is there but the berm is lower due to the topography so it may be less visible.

Mr. Martin stated they had also requested elevations from Route 146 and he did not see them. Mr. Martin stated he wants to see more than one small row of trees when they come back. Mr. Ferraro stated he would like the same.

Ms. Coons stated that this is western Clifton Park and she feels this project is not rural looking. Ms. Coons gave a tree pamphlet to the applicant from the Tree Committee and stated they can use it for reference when doing the landscaping, as it may help. Ms. Coons stated there is parking listed at 108 spaces provided and only 78 parking spaces is required, and asked why. Mr. Costa stated this is not self-storage and as flex space there are more people on the site likely requiring more parking. Mr. Costa stated they can bank the extra parking for now, but have approvals in place to develop the additional parking spaces if permitted tenants require such.. Ms. Coons asked if the applicant would consider placing solar on the roofs of the buildings as they are flat roofs. Mr. Costa stated he does not know if it was considered by his client.

Mr. Andarawis asked why Phase II cannot move further south and move the stormwater to the west. Mr. Costa stated there is a 100' wetlands buffer preventing such. Mr. Andarawis stated the Vista from Route 146 is open and berming will be needed but if it can all move south the line of sight from Route 146 heading west could be an advantage to minimizing visual impacts. Mr. Costa stated the stormwater needs to be in the location proposed as the low spot water moves to under natural conditions and there would be a lot of earthwork required to significantly alter the drainage patterns. He stated that they are right up to the wetlands buffer as well. Mr. Andarawis stated he is concerned with how close to the north the project is and how little space for buffers there is and suggested maybe the intensity of the build-out shown may be too intense to adequately mitigate concerns raised and impacts.

Mr. Ferraro stated this also causes concern for the easement from the senior complex as well. Mr. Scavo stated he is not sure how far the gas main easement is to allow for moving the project. Mr. Costa stated this would impact the berm as well. Mr. Ferraro stated there will most likely be a trail along Route 146 as well. Mr. Ophardt stated they may need an easement for the gas line to collocate a trail so this may cut down on the room for buffering. He stated the applicant needs to look into this.

Mr. Andarawis stated he feels there are one too many rows of buildings for space on the site and this leaves less than ideal room for landscaping.

Mr. Ferraro stated direct access from Route 146 is also a concern of his. He stated with the rate of speed traveled within the corridor he does not it is safe to make a left turning movement into

3/24/26

traffic onto Route 146 from the site. He stated there may be a roundabout at Miller Road and Route 146 and suggested to prohibit left turning out of the site and to direct the traffic to Miller Road, for those going west on Route 146. He stated any entrance to the site from the east should also be from Miller Road, with a right in and right out on Route 146 only. Mr. Costa stated DOT approved the curb cut. Mr. Ferraro stated that he is requesting the issue be referred to the Town's Highway Safety Committee for review by the Town'. Mr. Lippmann asked for correspondence from NYS DOT is added to the file and agreed with Mr. Ferraro that this could possibly be a right in and out only. Mr. Lippmann stated they should look at the gap analysis as well.

Ms. Bagramian stated they should be careful not to put too much traffic on Miller Road as it is a residential road. Ms. Genovese stated people cut through Miller Road now and traffic moves fast.

Mr. Ophardt stated that some of these concerns can go to the Highway Safety Committee for review. Mr. Ferraro stated this is a good suggestion and Mr. Ophardt is on that committee so that helps with directing the concerns of this Board.

Ms. Fariello stated the bio retention area be added to the SEAF was requested at the last meeting and wanted to make sure this was done. Mr. Costa stated he would have to look into this.

Mr. Ferraro stated along with comments tonight, including but not limited to visual impacts from the highway and berms, the applicant needs to also address the lighting from Phase I.

Old Business:

#2025-051 103/105 Wood Rd Proposed Warehouse Site Plan (XAR)

SBL: 250.-2-49 Proposed 2 story 90'x60' warehouse with 2,500 SF second floor mezzanine on a 2.87 acre site with asphalt drive and parking for a total of 16 vehicles, 103/105 Wood Rd Zoned: L2 - Light Industrial 2, Status: Preliminary Applicant: XAR, Consultant: Empire Engineering, PLLC – C. Longo Last Seen On: 12/09/2025

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Christopher Longo stated he is present tonight for representing XAR and stated 103 would be used as the assigned postal address. He stated that this individual parcel is part of a bigger subdivision with a master plan and is a specific build out of a concept plan that was previously contemplated and there was a cumulative environmental evaluation with impacts. Mr. Longo stated they took 2 buildings from the prior application and combined them into one building resulting in less impervious area, with similar disturbance amount, and were able to keep away from the wetlands. He stated they were here in December and took back comments. Mr. Longo stated that the buffers to the wetlands have been modified as well. He stated the adjacent area

3/24/26

impacts are avoided and delineated wetlands that were identified in 2025 have been avoided as well. Mr. Longo stated since December the building has shrunk to 5,400 sf and justification for the second northern curb cut has been submitted as well. Mr. Longo stated all reviews for landscaping plans, stormwater plans, and lighting plans have been done. Mr. Longo stated a full SWPPP has been done. He stated he does not see any concerns with comments and feels they can be addressed.

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:

John Cochran, 120 Wood Road, stated he lives near this application. He stated he has no objections to the application but he has concerns about the lighting since it is in full view of his home. He stated his living room is across from the building and asked for light mitigation. Mr. Ferraro stated there appears to be existing trees to help buffer. Mr. Cochran stated there is but he does not know what will be removed. Mr. Longo stated there is a 100' buffer so all of the vegetation will remain and showed the clearing limits for site disturbance and there will be a down directed light, with a light shield for the parking area, and this is the only light in this direction.

Planning Board Review:

Ms. Coons stated the lights were called out in lumens and stated she feels they are a little bright. Mr. Longo stated they can downgrade the light selections for lower lumens and a softer color.

Mr. Martin stated the applicant has been helpful to down grade the lighting and to be compliant. Mr. Martin stated that there needs to be specific standards and asked who will work with them to achieve it. Mr. Longo stated there were comments by Mr. Lippmann that they can reflect on and they will work with staff to make sure they keep light within the property and it will be reflected in the photometric plan.

Mr. Andarawis stated the disturbance around the septic should be minimized as much as possible to allow for a robust buffer. Mr. Longo stated that inspections will be made and ensure wetlands and associated buffers are maintained.

Mr. Ophardt stated that the applicant has done a good job explaining to the Board why two driveways are needed.

Mr. Ferraro stated that Mr. Reese's comment about 208-66 d-f and asked about the façade design on the front. He suggested there be a brick façade similar to the other storage buildings fronting on Wood Road. Mr. Longo stated they would add that to the plan but they received the comment a little late and there has not been a discussion in depth yet but there will be brick or cultured

3/24/26

stone. Mr. Ferraro stated the landscaping seems to be satisfactory but he would like to see it more intense to ensure minimal light spillage. Mr. Longo stated there will be a row of trees on a raised berm to the south and to the north. Ms. Coons stated that a mix of trees would be nice. Mr. Andarawis stated he would like to see consistency with the surrounding properties.

Mr. Scavo stated SEQRA has already been established and does not sunset.

Ms. Bagramian moved, second by Ms. Fariello, to waive the final hearing for this application for the site plan review of, 103/105 Wood Rd Proposed Warehouse Site Plan (XAR) 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. Illumination Plan, Architectural Block and Landscaping Plans are approved by Planning Department Staff before final stamping of the plan.

Ayes: 7

Noes: 0

The motion is carried.

New Business:

#2026-010 Park Avenue Shoppers World Plaza Redevelopment Site Plan

SBL: 271.-3-81 Redevelopment of existing Shoppers World Plaza to include two 6,500± sf 1-story restaurant buildings and one 2,400± sf bar/tavern. Park Ave Zoned: TC5 - Neighborhood Zone, Status: Concept Applicant: RTM Asset Management Group, LLC, Consultant: EDP – J. Dannible

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Joe Dannible stated he is here tonight for a new development. He stated this is in the Town Center and part of a 13 acre parcel on the former Kmart parcel that was approved to have apartments previously by the Board. Mr. Dannible stated this is an infill development and feels this is a positive change. He stated this is a vacant parking lot currently. Mr. Dannible stated on Park Ave there will be parallel parking and 3 buildings flanking a center public space area. Buildings 1 and 3 could be breweries or restaurant uses permitted in the district and building 2 may possibly be a coffee shop with a possible drive thru. He stated there would be east/west entrances to the site and this is proposed as an in-fill plaza consistent with the Town Center Plan. He stated that there would be a lawn area or civic space available in the middle of the buildings to be utilized by the public. Mr. Dannible stated that they have frontage on three, maybe four

3/24/26

streets and this will enhance the Town Center with businesses and civic space. Mr. Dannible stated they want to move the process forward for a site plan approval to garner interest to identify tenants and then the applicant would likely proceed with preliminary review.

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 he likes what the applicant wants to do as the parking was always too large. He asked if no sewer is available what will be done or is there another way. He asked the frontage include a pedestrian path and parking is restricted to the rear. Mr. LaFleche stated he hopes whatever is done here he likes the green civic space that is being proposed.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Ferraro stated the application and notice are different and asked for clarification. Mr. Dannible stated buildings 1 and 3 to be taverns and one coffee shop with possible drive thru as building 2. Mr. Miller, owner, stated this is a concept plan so the uses are shown as potential tenants but it could be all or none of those shown and may end up being other permitted uses in the zoning district.. Mr. Ferraro stated that there are big differences between a review for a coffee shop vs. a tavern. Mr. Dannible stated they are looking for developing a plan to approve a shovel ready Town Center project and when a tenant comes in the building plan would likely need to be modified with the TAC and follow Form Based Code.

Mr. Martin stated that he likes the proposal, but the drive thru needs to be worked out and there needs to be a Special Use Permit for this use. He stated he would like to review the 3 buildings with no drive thru tonight so they can have a discussion. Mr. Dannible agreed. Mr. Ferraro stated he does have concerns with a drive thru.

Ms. Coons asked if there is EV parking proposed. Mr. Dannible stated there is not but they plan to be EV ready.

Ms. Bagramian stated she is a fan of the project, infilling and using old space while adding green space available to the public as well. She stated this is welcoming for the Town. She stated this is the intent of the zone and likes it since it is taking people off of Route 146 and Route 9.

Mr. Martin stated he is not averse to parallel parking. Mr. Dannible stated this will become a downtown street vision for people to gather.

Ms. Fariello stated her concern is the event space; she asked if it would be a park or private space. She stated she has concerns with bored teenagers. Mr. Dannible stated every space in the

3/24/26

Town has the potential for this, but it will be privately owned and will have set hours. He stated the restaurants will be in use there, and cameras are mostly included in these establishments as well, and this is a public street. Ms. Bagramian added that this is an area that will be well lit.

Mr. Andarawis likes this project but is not happy with a drive thru as he is not a fan in general. And it is particularly problematic in the TC5 Zone. He stated it is harder to work with the pedestrian access you are trying to achieve.. He stated this needs to be designed right even though it is not an easy lift, but he has not seen it work so far. Mr. Dannible stated if a drive thru does come to fruition it will be done in a manner that will be safe for pedestrians and promote connectivity. If a drive thru does come in hopefully it will be something like a coffee shop where they are open and busy during less active pedestrian hours and then they are closed off for greater pedestrian access later in the day. Ms. Bagramian stated some of the new companies are not doing drive thru but a DoorDash type of service. Mr. Ferraro stated a drive thru may be a conflict with pedestrians and as the site plan looks now there is a concern, perhaps this can be looked at in the TAC and in a redesign. Mr. Dannible stated that there are examples of where different types of planning is put into the designs to make these types of uses work such as in Virginia and New Jersey where the planning is focused on timing changes.

Mr. Ophardt stated that he likes the on-street parking. He discussed spatial layout, building orientation, and use of the open space. He suggested other layout options as well, to help create an identity for the location. Mr. Miller stated that when they started the plan they struggled with the different needs of this site. He stated that with numerous layouts, they struggled with things like placement of garbage, screening and deliveries. He stated they are focusing on how to encourage pedestrians in from the other roadways and surrounding locations. There are also parking requirements that need to be taken into account.

Ms. Westrick stated that the parking still feels excessive. She asked what parking requirements are required from the existing plans so that she can better understand the layout. She stated she feels there is a lot of pavement between the parking lot and the apartments and wondered if there was any plan for additional future development. Can the plans show more detail? She stated she would like to see some more accommodations for pedestrians. Mr. Dannible said more details would be added as the plans progressed. Ophardt asked if the applicant will dedicate the access road to make it a Town road. Mr. Dannible stated would is more of an alley to service the buildings. Mr. Dannible stated things like trash are not shown yet on the plan so when they are added it may make more sense. He stated there are many ways to lay out the site and with the help of the TAC he stated they can review this.

Mr. Andarawis stated what he does like about the center green area can tie in nicely with whatever may happen in the future on the south side of the site as it will be for the whole stretch of road.

3/24/26

Mr. Scavo stated he thinks the design honors the regulating plan. Mr. Ferraro stated he normally fully supports parallel parking but stated he feels it may create a conflict on Park Ave. He asked why this is necessary.. Mr. Dannible stated it may be required based on the code so he would have to look at the street map. Mr. Ophardt stated he feels this is a good buffer between traffic and pedestrians and patrons and will provide a quick in and out for people picking things up. Mr. Ferraro stated this may cause conflict on the road as well due to people backing into spots. He stated that landscaping could also help with dividing the walkway from the street.

Mr. Scavo stated a poll will be sent out to form a team for the TAC meeting and up to three Planning Board members can be on the committee.

Discussion Items:

Determination of applicability for site plan review regarding patio upgrades at Van Patten Golf Club.

Chris Walsh from Platinum Property Care presented for Van Patten Golf Club. He stated that this is a 3 phase job. He stated there is an existing patio that needs repair and has no railing. He stated they would like to tear it down and rebuild and with the rebuild they would like to eliminate the ramp from the tee box to the patio to stop golfers from coming up and mingling with private parties. Mr. Walsh stated the wall would be extended and lead to the restaurant redirecting the foot traffic. He stated they will not eliminate any ADA areas and the patio square footage would remain the same. Mr. Walsh showed on the screen the tee box and showed where the ramp would be eliminated. He stated they are asking just to rebuild the wall for now. Mr. Walsh stated that it is now 6,500sf and they are asking for 7,450 sf, so they would be adding 950 sf, this is not to increase occupancy. Mr. Ferraro asked if they were adding patio space. Mr. Walsh stated they are by getting rid of the ramp. Mr. Walsh stated phase 2 would be a grill area. He stated now they are only looking to do the patio, and the first event is in May.

Mr. Martin stated they are adding a wall. Mr. Walsh stated they are rebuilding the wall and filling in patio space where the ramp was, it is the same number of blocks. Mr. Scavo stated there will not be more impervious space used.

Mr. Scavo stated this is before the Board because if the intensity is increased the Zoning Officer can send him to the Board to determine if the change needs a site plan. He stated that anything beyond phase 1 will need to come in for site plan review. Mr. Scavo recommended that phase 1 does not require review. He stated this would segregate the banquet space from the golfers.

Mr. Ophardt asked if this would increase the space on the patio. Mr. Scavo stated this would not increase it a lot as it is the space from the ramp and not significant.

3/24/26

Mr. Andarawis stated he agrees and stated the applicant would need to make sure the new patio would be reflected in the phase 2 site plans and moving forward.

Mr. Ferraro stated this is not a substantial change that needs site plan review, and the Town Planning staff can mitigate changes. Ms. Fariello moved, Ms. Bagramian seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

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.

Michael Murphy, 686 MacElroy Road, read from a letter he wrote to the Planning Board in regard to the solar farm proposal on MacElroy Road. Ms. Fariello moved, seconded by Mr. Ophardt, adjournment of the meeting at 10:05 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on April 14, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Cooper

Paula Cooper, Secretary

ATTACHED:

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

Review Comments by Permit#

Permit Number: SUB26-000005

| File# | Permit# | Project Name | Route Name | Activity Type | Reviewer | Completion Date | Comment |
|-----------|--------------|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | Fire Marshall Plans Review | John DeSimone | 04/13/2026 | No concerns at this time |
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | Postal Verification | John DeSimone | 04/21/2026 | Reference approved postal verification in documents |
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | Postal Verification | John DeSimone | 04/21/2026 | Postal verification will be finalized with accessor and Saratoga County Emergency Services when final approval from planning board is received |
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | Zoning Plans Review | Scott Reese | 04/22/2026 | This parcel is located in the Conservation Residential (CR) Zoning District. Per Town Code Chapter 208-16 D.(1)(b)[1] One-family dwelling and its accessory buildings is a permitted use. |
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | Zoning Plans Review | Scott Reese | 04/22/2026 | The total parcel area is 7.67 acres. Under Town Code Chapter 208-16 E(2)(a), parcels smaller than 10 acres may be developed at a maximum density of one dwelling unit per three acres of unconstrained land. The applicant has identified 1.63 acres as constrained land (wetlands) and 6.04 acres as unconstrained land. Based on this, the proposed development adheres to the allowable density of one dwelling unit per three acres of unconstrained land. The subdivision proposes two lots, which complies with the maximum density requirement. Lot #2 also conforms to the space and bulk standards outlined in Section 208-16 E(5)(a)(10). |
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | Zoning Plans Review | Scott Reese | 04/22/2026 | Applicant to show the environmental features that include the Land Conservation (LC) Zoning District on the subdivision plan. |
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | Zoning Plans Review | Scott Reese | 04/22/2026 | The surveyor should confirm whether the tie lines are still necessary given that the two lots will now be separated by the roadway. |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------|---|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|------------|--|
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | Stormwater Review | Scott Reese | 04/23/2026 | The proposed disturbance is less than one acre; therefore, coverage under the NYSDEC SPDES General Permit GP-0-25-001 is not required. The applicant is still required to implement erosion and sediment control measures consistent with NYSDEC standards to prevent off-site sediment transport. |
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | This review is based on the receipt and review of the updated submission materials dated 03/16/2026 through 04/22/2026, including the revised preliminary subdivision plan dated 03/16/2026, the updated Environmental Assessment Form dated 03/18/2026, and Planning Staff Review #2 dated 04/22/2026. |
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | The application appears to be complete for purposes of Preliminary Subdivision review. |
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | In accordance with Town Code Chapter 208-16 E(2)(a), parcels under 10 acres may be developed at a maximum density of one dwelling unit per three acres of unconstrained land. |
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | Based on the applicant's calculations, the proposed two-lot subdivision complies with the maximum allowable density in the CR District. |
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | The proposed disturbance area is less than one acre; therefore, coverage under the NYSDEC SPDES General Permit GP-0-25-001 is not required. |
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | Notwithstanding the above, the applicant shall implement erosion and sediment control measures consistent with NYSDEC standards to prevent off-site sediment transport during any site work or construction activities. |
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | No formal public access easement is proposed as part of this subdivision, and none is required under Chapters 179 or 208 of the Clifton Park Town Code, without voluntary participation by a private landowner in lieu of a parkland mitigation fee assigned by the Town Code's subdivision regulations. |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------|---|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|------------|---|
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | Recommended conditions of approval if granted by the Planning Board include: 1. Remove or note the approved subdivision map eliminates the shown tie-lines on the subdivision map; 2. Compliance with NYSDEC erosion and sediment control standards during construction; 3. Add the assigned 911 addresses to the final map, per the attached numbers provided from the Town's Fire Marshall; 4 Add the attached CADD Stamp File to the final plat prior to stamping. |
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | SEQR Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | No significant adverse environmental impacts have been identified based on the scope and scale of the proposed subdivision. |
| 26-000240 | SUB26-000005 | #2026-009 18 Robinson Street 2 Lot Subdivision | Subdivision - Preliminary | ECC Review | Scott Reese | 04/24/2026 | For all subdivided properties in the CR zone, deed restrictions need to be placed to prevent further subdivision in the future in order to respect the principles of the subdivision code of the CR Zone. |



April 22, 2026

Mr. Luigi P. Palleschi, PE
ABD Engineers, LLP
411 Union Street
Schenectady, New York 12305

Re: 18 Robinson Road
Tax Map ID 282.14-1-6.1
CP File: 2026-009
MJ File: 700.440

Dear Mr. Palleschi:

MJ Engineering, Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Land Surveying, P.C. (MJ) has reviewed the submission for the above referenced project. Documents received for our review included the following:

- Short Environmental Assessment Form signed and dated, March 16, 2026.
- Site Plan titled "Subdivision Plan of Lands Now or Formerly of Crown 61 LLC Street No. 18 Robinson Street" as prepared by ABD Engineers & Surveyors, LLP, 1 sheet in total, and dated March 16, 2026.
- Conceptual Pedestrian Access Route Map to Town owned property

Based upon our review of the above documents, we offer the following comments for consideration.

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

1. No further comments.

SUBDIVISION

2. Based on the unconstrained lands identified in the site statistics table, it appears that the density calculation required under Section 208-16(E)(2)(a) of the Town's Zoning Code for parcels under 10 acres has been satisfied. A total of two lots are permitted, and two lots are being proposed.
3. The proposed septic system design should account for the locations of neighboring wells to ensure all required separation distances are maintained in accordance with NYSDOH Appendix 75-A. Show the neighboring wells on the site plan.
4. Subsequent plans shall show the Town's LC location and boundaries which are defined by Section 208-69.1 of the Town's Zoning.
5. Provide notation on the plan as follows:
 - a. No Utilities shall be installed beneath the proposed driveways.
 - b. Any work required within the Town right-of-way shall be subject to any permitting from the Clifton Park Highway Department (driveway, culvert).



6. Prior to approval or filing of the subdivision plat with the Saratoga County Clerk, the appropriate 911 emergency response numbers must be obtained for and assigned to each lot created and placed on the filed plat.

The applicant shall provide written responses to all technical comments provided by Town staff and consultants as part of the next submission. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (518) 371-0799.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'W. Lippmann', written over a horizontal line.

Walter F. Lippmann, P.E.
Associate, Land Development Group Manager

ecc: Clifton Park Planning Board
John Scavo, Director of Planning
Scott Reese, Zoning Administrator/Stormwater Management Officer
Jennifer Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator
Melinda Acker

Review Comments by Permit#

Permit Number: spr26-000013

| File# | Permit# | Project Name | Route Name | Activity Type | Reviewer | Completion Date | Comment |
|-----------|--------------|---|------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | Postal Verification | John DeSimone | 04/13/2026 | Reference approved postal verification in documents page 5 |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | Postal Verification | John DeSimone | 04/13/2026 | Postal verification will be finalized with Saratoga County emergency services upon final planning approval. |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | Stormwater Review | Scott Reese | 04/23/2026 | Projects that rely on Chapter 9 of the NYSDEC Stormwater Management Design Manual to justify alternative stormwater management approaches must first demonstrate that providing on-site treatment is not practicable. Because this parcel contains an existing stormwater management area (SMA), the applicant must include the SMA in the stormwater report and evaluate its ability to meet post-construction stormwater control requirements. The applicant must clearly justify why the existing SMA cannot be used, either in whole or in part, to achieve compliance. |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | Stormwater Review | Scott Reese | 04/23/2026 | The design point must be established at the existing 12-inch HDPE outlet of the on-site SMA, as this represents the hydrologic discharge location of the property. |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | Stormwater Review | Scott Reese | 04/23/2026 | The Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan identifies oil-water separators in two catch basins; this requirement should also be reflected in the catch basin detail, with the manufacturer's type of oil-water separator clearly specified. Additionally, a detail of the proposed hydrodynamic separator should be included, as the |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------|---|------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------|------------|--|
| | | | | | | | sizing of this structure is integral to the water quality treatment design. |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | Zoning Plans Review | Scott Reese | 04/23/2026 | This parcel is located in the Neighborhood Business (B-3) Zoning District. Per Town Code Chapter 208-37(B) both convenience food store and drive-in restaurant are permitted uses. |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | Zoning Plans Review | Scott Reese | 04/23/2026 | This parcel has an approved area variance of 130 feet to allow for a portion of a restaurant building (Dunkin Donuts) 170 feet from a residential zone. Per Town Code Chapter 208-37 (B) no drive-in restaurant shall be located within 300 feet of the boundary line of any residential district. |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | Zoning Plans Review | Scott Reese | 04/23/2026 | This parcel has an approved area variance for 2 additional pumps (total of 6 pumps) and 2 additional nozzles (total of 14 total nozzles) and the increase of 852 square feet of the convenient store (total of 5,852 square feet). |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | ECC Review | Scott Reese | 04/24/2026 | The ECC notes that the project includes extensive paving adjacent to, or in the vicinity of ACOE protected lands. The ECC recommends that the Planning Board require the Applicant to incorporate sediment traps and oil water separators with appropriate capacity to limit the migration of vehicular contaminants into these sensitive environments. |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | ECC Review | Scott Reese | 04/24/2026 | The ECC requests the lighting plan should be in compliance with International Dark Sky Standards. |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | ECC Review | Scott Reese | 04/24/2026 | Considering the Town of Clifton Park as designated as a Tree City USA municipality the ECC discourages unnecessary removal of mature trees in order to preserve the character of the site. The ECC notes that several of the existing mature trees appears to be 40 feet in height and provides significant aesthetic, functional shade, and habitat benefits to the site. |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|------------|---|
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | ECC Review | Scott Reese | 04/24/2026 | The ECC concurs with the finding of Saratoga County Public Works as noted in the April 22, 2026, letter from the Saratoga County Planning Board "Requesting that the applicant evaluate modifying the access to the site by removing the ingress/egress on Crescent Road and utilizing the existing service road that surrounds the site. Ingress/Egress onto McKenna Way provides direct access to a signalized intersection." |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | ECC Review | Scott Reese | 04/24/2026 | The ECC requests the Planning Board require the applicant to comply with Town Code 149-6 & 149-8 with respect to noise. |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | ECC Review | Scott Reese | 04/24/2026 | The ECC requests the Planning Board to require the applicant to add additional native non-deciduous trees to the site plan. |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | The revised concept materials submitted on March 31, 2026, and refined through April 2026 represent a more fully developed and responsive site plan compared to earlier submissions. From a planning standpoint, the current layout: 1. Consolidates development intensity into a defined commercial footprint; 2. Clarifies internal circulation patterns; and 3. Provides a clearer framework for mitigation measures related to neighboring properties to address concerns raised to date. The Planning Board's review at this stage is appropriately focused on how the permitted uses function on the site, not whether the uses should exist. |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | Traffic remains a prominent public concern, both for this application and historically for Crescent Road |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|---|
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | From a Planning Staff perspective the traffic generation associated with a convenience store, fuel facility, and drive thru restaurant is an anticipated characteristic of a B 3 Neighborhood Business zoning district. The revised submissions reflect professional traffic evaluation and agency coordination, and the Board's role is limited to ensuring safe and logical site access, internal circulation, and alignment with agency recommendations. Importantly, cumulative corridor congestion or regional growth patterns are not issues that can be resolved through individual site plan denial, but rather through capital planning, zoning policy, and inter agency coordination beyond this application. |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | Concerns regarding noise, particularly late, night activity, drive thru operations, and vehicle movement, have been raised consistently by the public. At the site plan level, the Board's authority is limited to: Ensuring site design and layout minimize avoidable impacts; and requiring compliance with the Town's adopted noise performance standards. The revised plan allows the Board to consider physical and spatial mitigation tools (building placement, circulation orientation, and buffering), but not to regulate day to day business operations beyond enforceable code provisions. |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | I recommend the landscaping plan and buffering effectiveness focus on year round effectiveness to the maximum extent practicable, particularly in areas adjacent to residential properties. |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | Fear of lighting impacts, especially spillover and glare affecting nearby properties], has been a recurring issue for projects along this corridor. The revised submissions allow the Board to: Evaluate fixture placement, mounting height, and photometric performance; and Ensure lighting is designed to illuminate the site without projecting impacts beyond property boundaries. The final lighting |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|---|
| | | | | | | | plans shall demonstrate compliance with Town standards and best practices, as lighting design is a site plan issue, not an operational one. |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | Based on the revised concept materials submitted on or after March 11, 2026, the application is appropriate for continued site plan review, with continuing focus directed toward: 1. Refinement of buffering and landscape effectiveness; 2. Careful review of lighting design to prevent off site impacts; and 3. Confirmation that site circulation and access function safely and efficiently. These are areas where the Town Planning Board has clear authority and where thoughtful conditions of approval can meaningfully address community concerns while remaining consistent with New York State law and the Town's zoning framework and scope of the Board's authority. |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | Per the attached recommendation, the Saratoga Co. Planning Board requested additional information, specific to traffic and ingress/egress access onto Crescent Road a County Highway. |
| 25-002199 | SPR26-000013 | #2026-002 1532 Crescent Rd. QuickChek Convenience Store with Fuel and Restaurant with Drive Thru | Site Plan Review - Revised Concept | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | Update the zoning table on the site plan to reflect the permit number and date the ZBA granted the relief by area variance approval. |



April 22, 2026

Ms. Caryn Mlodzianowski
Bohler Engineering and Landscape Architecture, NY PLLC
17 Computer Drive West
Albany, New York 12205

**Re: 1532 Crescent Road Convenience Store with Fuel and Drive Thru
Tax Map ID 284-1-9.1
CP File: 2026-002
MJ File: 700.436**

Dear Ms. Mlodzianowski:

MJ Engineering, Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Land Surveying, P.C. (MJ) has reviewed the submission for the above referenced project. Documents received for our review included the following:

- Short Environmental Assessment Form dated December 16, 2025.
- Site Development Plans titled "Convenience Store with Fuel Sales and Restaurant with Drive-In" as prepared by Bohler Engineering NY, PLLC, 16 sheets in total, and dated March 27, 2026.
- Project Narrative dated March 31, 2026.
- Exterior Design Guideline, dated June 8, 2023
- Traffic Impact Evaluation as prepared by Lansing Engineering dated February 6, 2026.
- SHPO Correspondence dated February 10, 2026.
- Land Survey prepared by Control Point Associates Inc PC, dated May 27, 2025.
- Comment response letter to Town Staff dated March 31, 2026.

Based upon our review of the above documents, we offer the following comments for consideration.

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

1. Based upon our review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an "Unlisted" action. If the Planning Board is to request Lead Agency status under SEQRA, the need to undergo a coordinated review is optional. Under a coordinated review, involved / interested agencies to be engaged may include, but is not necessarily limited to the following:
 - a. Town of Clifton Park Planning Board: Plan approval
 - b. Clifton Park Water Authority: Water Connection
 - c. Saratoga County Sewer District #1: SCSD Connection
 - d. Saratoga County Planning: 239-m County Referral
 - e. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation: Stormwater discharge
 - f. New York State Department of Transportation: Proximity to NYS I-87
 - g. NYS Historic Preservation Office: Archeological sensitive area

Additional agencies may be identified by the Town during its review of the project.



The applicant has submitted Part 1 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF). Based upon our review of the submitted Part 1 SEAF, the following comments are offered:

2. No further comments at this time.

SITE PLANS

Cover – Sheet C-101

3. No comments.

General Notes and Legend – Sheet C-102

4. No comments.

Jurisdictional Notes – Sheet C103

5. No comments.

Existing Conditions/Demolition Plan – Sheet C-201

6. Identify the components that will be demolished and or relocated.

Site Plan – Sheet C-301

7. A table has been added to reflect the granted area variances. They include the convenient store footprint of 5,852 SF (5,000 SF allowed) and 6 sets of pumps with 14 nozzles (4 sets of pumps and 12 nozzles allowed).
8. The parking requirements table shows that 68 spaces are required by code, and 69 spaces are proposed as part of this project.
9. Since the gas canopy has been reduced in size, consider installing a grass island in place of the large hatched pavement area. This will avoid creating an oversized paved section that customers may drive over and that could lead to operational issues.
10. Indicate if there are any existing stormwater management areas on site.
11. The proposed entrance on Crescent Road (County Route 92) appears to be modified to allow right-turn entry. This should be reviewed by the County to confirm its acceptability. Signage may be required to notify motorists that left turns are not permitted from Crescent Road.
12. The ADA accessible aisles in front of the proposed convenience store show only an 8-foot-wide stall, the standard for the Town of Clifton Parks is 9 feet x 18 feet for all stalls.
13. Confirm there is adequate space between bollards and sign post for ADA accessibility from the accessible parking aisle.



14. Show where snow storage is being provided within the project site.
15. Provide notation on subsequent plans indicating that all work proposed within the County Route 92 right-of-way are subject to a highway work permit issued by the County Highway Department.
16. It appears the eastern most diagonal parking spaces in the southeast corner of the site protrudes into the drive thru lane. Please verify and revise accordingly.
17. Indicate whether roof top mechanical units are proposed and how screening may be incorporated to shield them from the public view.
18. The following comments are relative to the site plan and its conformance to the NYS Fire Code (NYSFC). The Town Fire Official shall have final authority on the applicability of these comments to the proposed site layout:
 - a. If the proposed building is to be provided with an automatic sprinkler, show the location of the fire department connection to ensure they are reasonably accessible.
 - b. Section 912.2 of the NYSFC requires a fire hydrant to be located within 100-feet of the building's fire department connection. It is not clear from the plans where the closes hydrant to the site is or where the fire department connection may be. Additional hydrants may be necessary.
 - c. Identify the actual height of the buildings. If greater than 30-feet in height above the average grade plan, aerial apparatus access shall be provided that is between 15 and 30 feet of one entire side of the building in accordance with Appendix D105 of the NYSFC. If aerial apparatus access is required, its location shall be identified on the plans.
 - e. Provide a turning template analysis for the largest emergency vehicle that may respond to an event at the site.

Colored Site Plan – Sheet C-302

19. No comments.

Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan – Sheet C-401

20. It appears that most of the site, excluding the hot spot area, drains toward the rear of the property. The SWPPP will need to be reviewed to ensure all WQv, RRv, and quantity controls are properly addressed. Aerial imagery indicates that the rear of the property is wooded, and as the project advances, this area may need to be cleaned up if it being utilized as a stormwater management area.

Utility Plan – Sheet C-501

21. The submitted information indicates the project is proposing to connect to an existing water main(s) within proximity to the parcel. These mains are owned and operated by the Clifton Park



Water Authority (CPWA). It is recommended that the Town be furnished with documentation that the CPWA is willing and capable of providing potable water to the project.

22. The submitted information indicates the project is proposing to connect to an existing sewer main(s) within close proximity to the parcel. These mains are owned and operated by the Saratoga County Sewer District No. 1 (SCSD). It is recommended that the Town be furnished with documentation that the SCSD is willing and capable of providing sanitary sewer service to the project.
23. Provide anticipated water and sewer usage information.
24. Provide the invert elevations for the proposed sewer piping, including those through the proposed grease traps.
25. Verify all utility crossings (water, sewer, gas) provide adequate vertical separation.
26. Identify the size and materials of construction for the proposed water service.
27. Identify the method of connection to the water main.

Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan – Sheet C-801

28. Most of the proposed silt fence is shown inside the limits-of-disturbance line. The silt fence should be placed at the outermost edge of all soil-disturbance areas to ensure proper on-site sediment control.
29. Provide additional silt fence west of the proposed topsoil stockpile to prevent sediment accumulating in the existing low spot.
30. Show the location of the concrete washout area.
31. Pursuant to Section 6.4.5 of the NYSSMDM, permanent vegetative cover shall achieve 80% uniform density established over the entire contributing pervious area, before runoff is directed into the facility (F-5). Provide a note indicated this on the plan.

Erosion and Sediment Control Notes and Details – Sheet C-803

32. No comments.

Construction Details – Sheet C-901

33. No comments.

Construction Details – Sheet C-902

34. Painted Accessible spaces should be shown 9 feet wide.



Construction Details – Sheet C-903

35. Filtration Basin, Note 1 should refer to the NYS Stormwater Design Manual not Nashville and Davidson County.
36. Provide the WQv, 1-year, 10-year and 100-year storm elevations on the section view.
37. Confirm Note 4 should reflect the filter media which should meet the requirements shown in Table 6.14 of the NYSSWDM of ASTM C-33 Sand: 60%-75% Topsoil: 25%-40% and shall conform to NYSDOT Standard Specification 713-01 for roadside topsoil mix.
38. Add a note indicating "Refer to bioretention landscape plan (Sheet L-101) developed in accordance with Section 6.4.6 of the NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual.
39. Provide a detail of the proposed catch basin with integrated oil/water separator.

Landscape Plan – Sheet L-101

40. The Planning Board may require additional landscaping.

Landscape Notes and Details – Sheet L-102

41. No comments.

Lighting Plan – Sheet L-201

42. All pole mounted fixtures and wall packs should be full-cutoff or shielded.

STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN

43. Provide the calculations and include in the modeling the existing stormwater management area.
44. Provide the water quality calculation sheet for the entire project area.
45. The SWPPP shall include documentation that the project is eligible for permit coverage pursuant to Part I.A.3 of GP 0-25-001 with respect to threatened and endangered species. This includes both listed state and federal species.
46. The SWPPP shall include documentation that the project is eligible for permit coverage pursuant to Part I.A.4 of GP 0-25-001 with respect to historic properties. This includes archeological and cultural resources.
47. Provide a draft eNOI for review.
48. Since it appears the on-site stormwater management facilities will be privately owned, a maintenance agreement should be executed with the Town of Clifton Park.



TRAFFIC IMPACT EVALUATION

49. The Traffic Impact Evaluation Report is currently under review by our Transportation Department. Their comments will be issued under separate cover.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (518) 371-0799.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'W. Lippmann', written over a faint, larger version of the same signature.

Walter F. Lippmann, P.E.
Associate, Land Development Group Manager

ecc: Clifton Park Planning Board
 John Scavo, Director of Planning
 Scott Reese, Zoning Administrator/Stormwater Management Officer
 Jennifer Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator
 Melinda Acker

Review Comments by Permit#

Permit Number: spr26-000011

| File# | Permit# | Project Name | Route Name | Activity Type | Reviewer | Completion Date | Comment |
|-----------|--------------|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|
| 26-000104 | SPR26-000011 | #2026-005 898 Route 146 Office Accessory Building Site Plan | Site Plan Review - Preliminary | Fire Marshall Plans Review | John DeSimone | 04/14/2026 | Knox box will be required (form provided during building permit process) |
| 26-000104 | SPR26-000011 | #2026-005 898 Route 146 Office Accessory Building Site Plan | Site Plan Review - Preliminary | Fire Marshall Plans Review | John DeSimone | 04/14/2026 | No other concerns or comments |
| 26-000104 | SPR26-000011 | #2026-005 898 Route 146 Office Accessory Building Site Plan | Site Plan Review - Preliminary | Postal Verification | John DeSimone | 04/14/2026 | Accessory structure will fall under existing postal number, 898 Rt 156. Additional postal number is not required for this project. |
| 26-000104 | SPR26-000011 | #2026-005 898 Route 146 Office Accessory Building Site Plan | Site Plan Review - Preliminary | Zoning Plans Review | Scott Reese | 04/14/2026 | The parcel is located in the Business Non-Retail 1 (B-1) Zoning District. The parcel has three area variances (#21731, #80691, and #81276). The parcel has an existing HVAC business that operates as a general business office. Per Town Code Chapter 208-32 A. (1) this is a permitted use. |
| 26-000104 | SPR26-000011 | #2026-005 898 Route 146 Office Accessory Building Site Plan | Site Plan Review - Preliminary | Zoning Plans Review | Scott Reese | 04/14/2026 | This parcel was granted the two following area variances by the ZBA on March 13, 2026. 1.Per Town Code Chapter 208-35 D. (2) No building shall be placed closer to a side property line than 25 feet. The proposed building is located 18 feet from the side property line. A 7-foot relief from the code was granted. 2. Per Town Code Chapter 208-35 D. (2) No building shall be placed closer to a rear property line than 25 feet. The proposed building is located 10 feet from the side property line. A 15-foot relief from the code was granted. |
| 26-000104 | SPR26-000011 | #2026-005 898 Route 146 Office Accessory | Site Plan Review - Preliminary | Zoning Plans Review | Scott Reese | 04/14/2026 | Per Town Code Chapter 208-35 D. (4.) Buffer. There shall be established a minimum ten-foot buffer area, within the minimum side and rear yard setback, |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|------------|--|
| | | Building Site Plan | | | | | along the property lines. The buffer shall be planted for purposes of screening from adjoining properties. The Planning Board shall take into consideration any natural vegetation which exists and serves the intent of this article. Once the grading plan is provided the applicant may need to add new plantings to show that it meets this requirement. |
| 26-000104 | SPR26-000011 | #2026-005 898 Route 146 Office Accessory Building Site Plan | Site Plan Review - Preliminary | Stormwater Review | Scott Reese | 04/23/2026 | The applicant submitted a Stormwater Management Narrative dated March 2026 indicating that the proposed modifications will not alter the site's existing stormwater drainage characteristics; I find this conclusion acceptable. |
| 26-000104 | SPR26-000011 | #2026-005 898 Route 146 Office Accessory Building Site Plan | Site Plan Review - Preliminary | ECC Review | Scott Reese | 04/24/2026 | The ECC recommends that the planning board not approve the second entrance on to NY Rt 146 due to traffic safety concerns. |
| 26-000104 | SPR26-000011 | #2026-005 898 Route 146 Office Accessory Building Site Plan | Site Plan Review - Preliminary | ECC Review | Scott Reese | 04/24/2026 | Considering the Town of Clifton Park as designated as a Tree City USA municipality the ECC discourages unnecessary removal of mature trees to allow for the second access to NY Rt 146. The ECC notes that at least one of the existing mature trees appears to be 40 feet in height and provides significant aesthetic, functional shade, and habitat benefits to the site. |
| 26-000104 | SPR26-000011 | #2026-005 898 Route 146 Office Accessory Building Site Plan | Site Plan Review - Preliminary | SEQR Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | The Saratoga Co. Planning Board issued a recommendation in accordance with GML Section 239m that the project has no significant county-wide or inter-community impact, and a comment that a NYS DOT work Permit will be required for improvements within the Rt. 146 ROW. |
| 26-000104 | SPR26-000011 | #2026-005 898 Route 146 Office Accessory Building Site Plan | Site Plan Review - Preliminary | SEQR Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | Although no new environmental impacts have been identified in the post March 11 submissions, the Planning Board may wish to acknowledge that this project represents a modest intensification of an already developed commercial site; and approval does not establish precedent for additional accessory structures or expanded service uses without further review. |
| 26-000104 | SPR26-000011 | #2026-005 898 Route | Site Plan Review - | Planning Director | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | The Saratoga Co. Planning Board issued a recommendation in accordance with |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|---|
| | | 146 Office Accessory Building Site Plan | Preliminary | Plans Review | | | GML Section 239m that the project has no significant county-wide or inter-community impact, and a comment that a NYS DOT work Permit will be required for improvements within the Rt. 146 ROW. |
| 26-000104 | SPR26-000011 | #2026-005 898 Route 146 Office Accessory Building Site Plan | Site Plan Review - Preliminary | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | Add a note to the plan stating that the accessory structure remains functionally subordinate to the existing office building over time; and No independent business operations, customer-facing services, or separate tenancy are established within the accessory structure without further Planning Board review. |
| 26-000104 | SPR26-000011 | #2026-005 898 Route 146 Office Accessory Building Site Plan | Site Plan Review - Preliminary | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | The applicant has incorporated the variances granted distances shown on the current site plan drawings. Add a note to the plan stating that These dimensional variances granted are for the proposed building accessory building footprint. Therefore, and future site modifications do not incrementally intensify the relief granted, particularly given the constrained rear yard condition. |
| 26-000104 | SPR26-000011 | #2026-005 898 Route 146 Office Accessory Building Site Plan | Site Plan Review - Preliminary | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | Where existing vegetation contributes meaningfully to screening and is not shown within the limits of site disturbance, the applicant shall ensure its preservation during the construction of the accessory structure and site access improvements |
| 26-000104 | SPR26-000011 | #2026-005 898 Route 146 Office Accessory Building Site Plan | Site Plan Review - Preliminary | Planning Director Plans Review | John Scavo | 04/24/2026 | Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the new accessory structure, the striping, signage, and internal circulation controls will be confirmed for installation in accordance with the approved site plan. |



April 22, 2026

Mr. Joe Dannible
Environmental Design Partnership
900 Route 146
Clifton Park, New York 12065

**Re: 898 Route 146 Accessory Building Site Plan
Tax Map ID 271.-4-20
CP File: 2026-005
MJ File: 700.439**

Dear Mr. Dannible:

MJ Engineering, Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Land Surveying, P.C. (MJ) has reviewed the submission for the above referenced project. Documents received for our review included the following:

- Preliminary Site Plan Set titled "Northeast HVAC Solutions" as prepared by Environmental Design Partnership, LLP, 1 sheet in total, and dated March 19, 2026.
- TDE Comment Response Letter as prepared by Environmental Design Partnership, LLP, and dated April 14, 2026.

GENERAL

1. Based upon our review of the above documents, all prior comments have been adequately addressed.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (518) 371-0799.

Sincerely,



Walter F. Lippmann, P.E.
Associate, Land Development Group Manager

ecc: Clifton Park Planning Board
John Scavo, Director of Planning
Scott Reese, Zoning Administrator/Stormwater Management Officer
Jennifer Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator
Melinda Acker