



PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES (FINAL)

THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 2017

7:00 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL ROOM

CALL TO ORDER: Mark Torpey, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:01 P.M.

SALUTE TO THE FLAG:

PRESENT: Mark Torpey, Chairman; Janet Casey; Clifford Van Wagner; Jamin Totino;
Amy Durland; Ruth Horton, alternate; Todd Fabozzi

ABSENT: Bob Bristol, Vice Chairman

STAFF: Kate Maynard, Principal Planner, City of Saratoga Springs
Justin Grassi, Attorney for the Land Use Boards

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RECORDING OF PROCEEDING:

The proceedings of this meeting are being recorded for the benefit of the secretary. Because the minutes are not a verbatim record of the proceedings, the minutes are not a word-for-word transcript of the recording.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ADJOURNED PROJECTS:

ADJOURNED PENDING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

1. **15.049 LANDS OF STONE**, 68 Weibel Avenue, sketch plan review of office, retail, and multi-family residential in the Transect-4 Urban Neighborhood (T-4) District.
2. **16.040 WEST AVENUE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT**, 106-120 West Avenue, Special Use permit for mixed-use development within the T-5 Neighborhood Center (T-5) District.
3. **16.046 SAMES MIXED-USE BUILDING**, 20 Bowman Street, Special Use Permit for residential on second floor Within the Tourist Related Business (TRB) District.
4. **13.002.2 THE HAMLET**, 52 Marion Avenue, Special Use Permit modification within the Transect-5 Neighborhood Center (T-5) District.

COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR:

Mark Torpey, Chairman noted the unanimous adoption of the Complete Streets Plan by the City Council. Kate Maynard, Principal Planner, City of Saratoga Springs will provide some background information.

Kate Maynard, Principal Planner, City of Saratoga Springs stated this is a citywide bike, pedestrian, transit plan. You are looking at physical recommendations and policies related to the improvement of those three modes of transportation ensuring we are providing for all users of the street. The City Council unanimously approved this City Wide Complete Streets Plan on December 20th. The plan will be a tool to incorporate into Planning Board review of projects- for example, a project site might reflect a prioritized sidewalk connection, or bike lanes along the street that can be factored into project consideration.

UPCOMING PLANNING BOARD MEETINGS/AGENDA WORKSHOPS:

Planning Board Caravan, Monday, January 23, 2016 at 4:00 P.M.
Planning Board Workshop, Monday, January 23, 2016 at 5:00 P.M.
Planning Board Meeting, Thursday, January 26, 2016 at 7:00 P.M.
Joint Land Use Board Meeting Planning Board and Design Review Commission-Thursday, January 26, 2017 at 5:30 P.M.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR:

None heard.

Mark Torpey, Chairman welcomed Amy Durland who has been appointed to the Board to complete Howard Pinsley's term. Amy has tremendous experience and brings a wealth of knowledge to the Board. We wish Howard Pinsley all the best in his recovery. Also, we welcome new Board member Todd Fabozzi. Todd also brings a tremendous amount of experience in regional planning to the Board.

Mark Torpey Chairman also noted a Regional Planner Conference scheduled for January 25, 2017. Kate Maynard asked members to please contact Lindsey to arrange for your registration. This one day conference does fulfill your yearly requirements for continuing education credits.

DISCUSSION ITEM:

SPRING PRESERVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Kate Maynard, Principal Planner stated that the Spring Preserve and management committee this is the Excelsior Park Project, the GEIS, and project conditions. There was a management plan completed for the open space area. There is a stewardship committee which was required to be in place to oversee the management plan. The membership is required to be appointed this evening. Dave Carr is here this evening to present the proposed members for your potential approval.

Agent: Dave Carr, LA Group

Mr. Carr stated the City holds a conservation easement for over approximately 20 acres. A visual presentation was provided to the Board. The committee was created as part of the approvals for the construction of this trail. The Spring Run Trail will be connected through the preserve area. The wetland work is to begin next month and should be finished in the summer. The Committee consists of 7 individuals, 3 from the existing Woods neighborhood, Dr. Richard Farrell, John Witt and Margaret White. The Woods representative would be Tim Peele, an educator, Ann Ernst, from Skidmore College, Saratoga Plan representative would be Devin Rigollino, and Tina Carton from the City of Saratoga Springs. There is no requirement for this committee to meet regularly. This is basically to preserve and protect. The only active recreation is the trail.

Discussion ensued among the Board concerning the appointment of individuals to this stewardship committee not confirmed tonight or replacements.

Clifford Van Wagner made a motion that the committee members proposed in the presentation this evening be approved by the Planning Board.

Jamin Totino seconded the motion.

Mark Torpey, Chairman asked if there was any further discussion.

VOTE:

Clifford Van Wagner, in favor; Jamin Totino, in favor; Ruth Horton, alternate, in favor;
Amy Durland, in favor; Todd Fabozzi, in favor; Mark Torpey, Chairman, in favor;

Janet Casey, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 7-0

A. APPLICATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

1. **17.002 CONGRESS STREET APARTMENTS**, 92 Congress Street, Special Use Permit for conversion of commercial building into multi-family residential within the Transect-6 Urban Core (T-6) District.

Mark Torpey, Chairman stated there was some improper public noticing for this project. The Board will be unable to take any action on this project this evening. The applicant is here and will provide the Board with a presentation of the project this evening.

SEQRA:

Action appears to be a Type 2 action, no further action is required.

BACKGROUND:

Existing 2 story building consists of 10,050 square foot commercial space in the T-6 Urban Core District. Proposal is to convert space to 8 apartments (4 on each floor).

City's zoning permits residential units on second floor and above with site plan review. Because residential is proposed on the first floor, a special use permit is required.

Applicant: DCG Development.

Agent: Matt Hurff, Frost Hurff Architects

Mr. Hurff stated this is a two story commercial building which the applicant would like to convert to this building for residential use. The building has been marketed very aggressively and cannot be sold. The deficiency pointed out by many potential buyers was the rear parking lot was too small. Efforts were made to make this project work and the building remains vacant. The neighborhood consists of a hotel, west side recreation, legends, an auto repair shop, the community center and surface parking lots. Despite the zoning the neighborhood has not caught up to the master plan. Mr. Hurff provided a visual presentation to the Board noting there is not much pedestrian activity in this area. There are 12 parking spots for onsite parking and 3 spots on the road. We are proposing 4 units on the first floor and 4 units on the second floor. All of the existing windows will be replaced with residential windows, and pretty modest changes to the building. If the character of the neighborhood should change in the future it would be fairly easy to change the building back. The space on the first floor is divided into two spaces but it is flexible space. There were offices there at one time but they are now gone.

Clifford Van Wagner questioned the look of the windows and his fear is this will look like a commercial building converted to apartments on the first floor. They do not look like residential windows.

Jamin Totino stated he agrees with Cliff. He is fine with residential upstairs and in the back of the building, however in the front on the street level I have a hard time with that. I walk that area all the time and I find there is a level of pedestrian activity. Especially since this area is being developed. I have only seen advertisements for office space in this area. I wonder what other variations were or could be considered on the ground floor.

Donald McElroy, DCG Development Corporation stated over the last 2 ½ years we have shown the building to both retail, office and medical use. Time and time again they come back with the availability of parking. We did have a retailer in the building in 2002. As of late the only use we have been able to put in the building is office use.

Mark Torpey, Chairman stated in the T-6 zone there is no requirement for parking.

Todd Fabozzi stated he agrees that Mr. Hurff's portrayal of the street is inaccurate. I have lived in this area for years and there is pedestrian traffic in this area. This is a pedestrian neighborhood and we want it to continue to develop to be a pedestrian area. Adding more parking in the downtown area is not what the plan is for this area.

Mr. Hurff stated that is fine but it is the main issue is why the building cannot find a tenant at this time.

Amy Durland stated part of the idea to have commercial be the expectation on the first floor in the T-6 district is to bring more pedestrian activity to the area. That is a key element of our zoning regulations which indicates for T-6 is retail, eating and drinking, office, residential and civic uses should be integrated at the building level. My question is if the biggest obstacle is parking then having only the two front uses in the building be commercial would that mitigate the need for all that additional parking which has been a deterrent for people who have been reluctant to use that as commercial space.

Mr. Hurff stated his sense is not, since there would be requirements for parking for the residential units.

Janet Casey questioned the two front commercial and 6 residential upstairs and in the rear. If you put some residential in there it might increase the traffic to the area and create interest in the commercial space.

Mark Torpey, Chairman offered the suggestion for a live work space.

Don Green, the owner spoke about the space for the last two years and trying to market the space.

Discussion ensued among the Board concerning the feasible alternatives, allowable uses and suggested the applicant rework the plans and return before the Board with additional suggestions and recommendations.

Justin Grassi, Attorney for the Land Use Board spoke concerning the Special Use Permit process.

Mark Torpey, Chairman stated the Board has provided some guidance and suggestions for the applicant.

2. **#16.025 MENDENHALL SUBDIVISION**, 101 Old Schuylerville Road, 4-lot preliminary conservation subdivision within the Rural Residential (RR) District.

Mark Torpey, Chairman stated the application is for a 4 lot subdivision. An existing single family home is sited on one of the lots and three remaining lots. We spoke at the workshop concerning the delineation of the DEC wetlands. As discussed at the workshop the Board is looking to position any lots to preserve the rural character. A clustering arrangement was suggested.

SEQRA:

Action appears to be an Unlisted Action. Short form Part 1 provided.

BACKGROUND:

The project site features an existing single family home and related accessory structures. Site's boundary on the west is Bog Meadow Creek, a large expanse of DEC wetland, a 100' buffer area, and ACOE wetlands. A conservation subdivision is required in the RR district. 4 lots and above requires preliminary and final subdivision approval.

Applicant: Norman and Kathelyn Mendenhall

Agent: Daniel Wheeler, Land Surveyor

Mr. Wheeler stated prior to our June submission the wetlands were delineated. In furnishing this application to the City we were instructed to have the wetland delineation confirmed by the DEC, and the Army Corp of Engineers. We had the wetlands redelineated by a different agent. He walked the property and did not agree with the original delineation. Once he completed the new delineation of the property DEC returned to the site and agreed with the new delineation. He wrote a letter stating that this was the correct delineation. The Army Corp of Engineers also agreed with the new delineation submitted. They issued a letter stating there would be no impact on the ACOE wetlands. A visual presentation was provided noting the latest delineation which has been accepted and verified.

Discussion ensued among the Board and they questioned some discrepancies with the wetland delineation.

Todd Fabozzi questioned some discrepancies with the wetlands and has had a conversation with Jed Hayden, at the DEC for clarification concerning the two maps. There was some confusion concerning the delineation. Mr. Hayden will be in touch with Mr. Wheeler.

Mr. Wheeler stated he will obtain supporting documentation from the agent who performed the re-delineation.

Kate Maynard, Principal Planner stated the information received from the DEC and the Army Corp of Engineers should be translated onto the map provided verbatim. To clarify this situation, the maps that are specifically referenced in DEC's letter need to be provided for review. Maynard will also contact DEC to directly discuss.

Mr. Wheeler stated he will also provide that information to the Board.

Discussion ensued concerning deferring SEQRA analysis until all information has been supplied.

Amy Durland stated a conservation analysis will be provided by the applicant. She questioned if a site visit might be indicated in this case.

Jamin Totino brought up the delineation for the no cut buffer.

Mr. Wheeler stated technical issues were discussed with Tim Wales, City Engineer and these will be completed to his satisfaction.

Kate Maynard, Principal Planner, City of Saratoga Springs questioned who would hold the easement.

Mr. Wheeler stated he believes it will be a reciprocal agreement.

Amy Durland questioned concerning SEQRA if this is contiguous concerning the water system to a critical environmental area and what the implications could be.

Mr. Wheeler stated we are downstream from the connection.

Discussion ensued among the Board concerning the fire department comments and scheduling a site visit.

3. **#17.005 GINLEY GOTTMAN ADVISORY OPINION TO THE CITY COUNCIL REGARDING PROPOSED ZONING MAP AMENDMENT FROM UR-2 TO T-5 DISTRICT**, area bordered by Ballston Avenue, Hamilton Street, and Finley Street.

DISCLOSURE:

Mark Torpey, Chairman stated he has used this law firm for a real estate transaction. He has no financial interest in

this application or anything pending. No need for recusal, simply disclosure.

Jamin Totino also stated he has used this law firm for a real estate transaction. He has no financial interest in this application or anything pending. No need for recusal, simply disclosure.

SEQRA:

Action appears to be a Type I with involved agency noted as City Council.

BACKGROUND:

City Council has noted the application has merit for further review and are requesting the required Advisory Opinion for a map amendment change from UR-2 to T-5.

The applicants have been interested in proposing higher density uses on their property and proximate properties. Active application before the ZBA for 22 townhomes units on portion of same area seeking a map amendment. They are seeking a number of area variances including minimum lot size, setbacks, etc. Use variance has been determined to also be required as parcel history:

- 2012 Petition for map amendment to the City Council. Withdrawn by the applicant.
- 96 Ballston Avenue, use variance to convert a single family residence to a law office denied 10/24/05. Decision appealed to NYS Supreme Court – board’s denial vacated, decision of the Court “petitioners are Entitled to judgment granting their application for a use variance to permit a law office at 96 Ballston Avenue.” (6/13/06). Decision was appealed to NYS Court of Appeals where prior judgment was affirmed (4/25/07).
- 116 Ballston Avenue, use variance for an investment and financial services office, approved (6/26/02).

Applicant: Mike Ginley, Steve Gottman

Mr. Gottman provided some additional maps and information to the Board. We have provided additional information which includes a summary of the properties, 24 parcels in question. Present zoning for each as well as present uses. A complete list of the owners who are presently in favor of this application. A proof of mailing was also provided to the Board via US Mail only. We did try to personally reach out to everyone in the neighborhood. We did make a mistake in the EAF there is no archeological sensitive area to rectify the item in question from the workshop.

Mr. Gottman provided a summary of the application to the Board. A visual presentation via a map noting the current zoning and what it would look like changed to a T-5 zone with the 24 lots denoting the changes. We are asking for this since the existing 24 lots are not a UR-2 zone. That is not what the use is. 60% of the current lots are not single family homes. 41.67% are single family. The remainder are 2 and 3 family homes and commercial. Presently this area does not jibe with what the current zoning code denotes. Secondly, the Comprehensive Plan in 2015 did change this area and under this plan it was renamed a Complementary Core District. Basically, it calls for higher density residential use interspersed with areas of commercial uses of moderate to high intensity uses. Under the present code we felt T-5 is very similar to this. Third there is no controversy for this and 13 of the 24 property owners have responded favorably supporting the change. We believe this is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Discussion ensued among the Board concerning the applicants request for the zoning map amendment and how this would affect current homeowners status.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mark Torpey, Chairman asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application.

None heard.

Mark Torpey, Chairman thanked the applicant for a thorough application and proposal and their persistence. Establishing a larger area indicates you are willing to take on a more holistic view of this whole area rather than just your own parcel.

Clifford Van Wagner made a motion for a positive Advisory Opinion to the City Council for a zoning map amendment as shown from a UR-2 to a T-5. The proposed revision is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the proposed revision is not contrary to the general purposes or intent of the zoning ordinance.

Janet Casey seconded the motion.

Mark Torpey, Chairman asked if there was any further discussion.

None heard.

VOTE:

Clifford Van Wagner, in favor; Jamin Totino, in favor; Ruth Horton, alternate, in favor;
Amy Durland, in favor; Todd Fabozzi, in favor; Mark Torpey, Chairman, in favor;
Janet Casey, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 7-0

- 5. **17.003 DEVALL CARRIAGE HOUSE**, 59 Franklin Street, Advisory Opinion (ZBA) on construction of a Carriage house within the UR-4 District.

SEQRA:

Action appears to be a Type II action with no further environmental review required.

PARCEL HISTORY:

- Area variance application submitted for a carriage house with apartment in April 2005 – it was determined that a use variance was also required – application was not supplemented.
- DRC Historic Review approval December 7, 1995.
- Site plan review approval October 15, 1986.
- Use and area variances for two apartments and a professional office approved December 11, 1985. Variance extensions 1994, 1995, and 1996.

AREA VARIANCE CONSIDERATIONS:

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	TOTAL RELIEF REQUESTED
Minimum side yard setback: Marvin Alley	20 ft.	5 ft.	15 ft. (75%)
Minimum total side yard setback:	45 ft.	30 ft.	15 ft. (33%)
Minimum front yard: Cherry St.	25 ft.	5 ft.	20 ft. (80%)

Mark Torpey, Chairman stated the ZBA specifically requested information concerning siting and orientation. The property is located within the Historic District adjacent to City Square where development is currently underway. This application will return to the Planning Board for Site Plan Approval. Comments were provided to the applicant on connectivity including sidewalks and curbing.

Applicant: David Devall; Richard Devall

Kate Maynard, Principal Planner stated reflecting the Planning Board workshop and discussion with the applicants, a 5ft. concrete sidewalk with streetscape amenities along Cherry Street and Marvin Alley will be required as part of the City's streetscape amenities.

Mr. DeVall stated they are looking to build a three stall carriage house at the rear of the property. Currently the property is listed as mixed use with a first floor attorney office and two apartments one upstairs and one in the rear. Two stalls will be dedicated the attorneys in the front building and one dedicated to the carriage house occupant. We have seen dramatic changes in the neighborhood. Behind us is the Ellsworth property. We are proposing this building to improve the property and also essentially to provide a historic carriage house buffer. The siting of this elsewhere on the site however would be aesthetically unpleasing and wasteful of the existing green space behind the building. Also it would be contrary to the traditional placement of a carriage house behind an 1823 Greek revival. This will have no adverse effect on the neighborhood, the district or the site itself.

Jamin Totino stated the sidewalks and streetscape amenities are required by the City of Saratoga Springs.

Mr. DeVall questioned the amount of available space for sidewalk installation and minimum setback requirements.

Janet Casey requested the applicant to present their siting of the building on the site.

Mr. DeVall presented a visual concerning the siting of the proposed carriage house to be sited fronting on Franklin Street.

Todd Fabozzi questioned the aesthetics of how this building will present on the alley and Cherry Street.

Discussion ensued concerning the siting of the proposed garage carriage house on the site and the possible reduction of the garage to a two bay garage. It was the consensus of the Board that the applicant return with a more significant site plan.

Mr. DeVall stated there is the possibility of closing off the access from Marvin Alley and using the Cherry Street access. Siting of the building in the manner in which we have presented does provide a buffer from Ellsworth Building construction since ours is the historic property.

Mark Torpey, Chairman stated with this plan there could be some additional buffering and additional green space in the area which was previously an egress to Marvin Alley.

Jamin Totino stated it is difficult to discuss and picture this site when the streetscape elements and requirements are not provided here. We are not looking at a real plan, this is theoretical only.

Mark Torpey, Chairman stated it would be helpful to understand what we are required to look at to ensure it is positioned properly prior to making our recommendations.

Clifford Van Wagner stated we could make our Advisory Opinion to the ZBA stated the Planning Board recommends this orientation. The Planning Board recommends with this Advisory Opinion no curb cut on Marvin Alley, with site plan issues to be determined at a later date. That gives us the flexibility we need. The ZBA is looking for siting and orientation recommendations only. Siting to be determined at Site Plan Review with no curb cut on Marvin Alley and we can then dissect this, pull it back perhaps to accommodate the 20 ft setback, provide street trees, provide street lights and a 5 ft. sidewalk and a green belt in the middle.

Jamin Totino stated he agrees with Cliff. I understand your point concerning the building serving as a buffer for you, but we as a Board need to be cognizant of what is happening on Cherry Street and Marvin Alley. We need to be sensitive to all sides.

Janet Casey stated perhaps this should be in the Advisory Opinion as well since the ZBA is concerned about siting, we should make it clear that we are fine with the siting facing Franklin Street but we want to be sure that all facades are not just blank walls. That people in the neighborhood are going to be seeing something that has some dynamism to it. I understand that it your intent with the Greek Revival design.

Amy Durland recommended to the applicant it would behoove you to meet with Kate and or Susan concerning some of these requirements in the City of Saratoga Springs and general layout.

Clifford Van Wagner recommended the applicant hire someone who is cognizant of all requirements of the City of Saratoga Springs.

Mark Torpey, stated perhaps it would behoove the applicant to return before this Board with more information and with a more significant site plan.

Mr. DeVall stated they erred in not providing an actual site plan with the application and will return before the Board with a more significant presentation.

9:16 P.M. The Board recessed.

9:24 P.M. The Board reconvened.

5. **17.004.1 PLAZA 15 SELF STORAGE**, Jones Road, SEQRA review of proposed construction of 70,000 square feet self-storage building within the Transect-4 (T-4) District.

Mark Torpey stated this application will return for a more in-depth review of the project for both Site Plan Review and Special Use Permit applications. The ZBA and DRC have proactively deferred Lead Agency Status to the Board.

SEQRA:

Action appears to be an unlisted action.

BACKGROUND:

Project proposed an additional 70,000 square foot of self-storage space to the existing facility. Project is currently before the ZBA seeking relief from the frontage build-to and build-out requirements in the Transect-4 District. DRC Architectural Review, Planning Board Special Use Permit and Site Plan Review are required.

Agent: Michael Toohey, Attorney; Brien Ragone, Landscape Architect, Environmental Design;
Mark Radden, Creighton Manning

Applicant: Plaza 15 Storage, LLC, Ben Aronsen

Mr. Toohey provided the Board with a visual presentation of the proposed site located in the Transect 4 zone north of the arterial. It is a developed site. We are seeking Area Variances and a Special Use Permit and Site Plan Review as well as Design Review approval to allow the construction of a climate controlled 70,000 square foot two story building on the site for self storage purposes. Significant storage currently exists on the site but it is not climate controlled. We are here this evening for SEQRA Lead Agency status and review of the SEQRA Part 1 and 2 of the short EAF.

Mr. Ragone stated the site is 3.2 acres along Plaza Road, east of the existing self storage. The application is a multi-step process appearing before the ZBA and the Planning Board and Design Review Commission. The property is located in a T-4 zone and all proposed development in this zone requires a Special Use Permit. A visual presentation of the site notes multiple easements that cross the property which necessitates these variances. National Grid easement

bisects the property, and a water main easement owned by the City of Saratoga Springs which runs along the entire border of the property line and a Saratoga County sewer easement which also runs from the northern to the western edge of the property line and an additional water main easement which runs along the southern property lines for the adjacent properties and a sanitary sewer easement along the southwestern portion of the site for the adjacent properties. The proposed 1.65 acre site is the only place it can be placed on the site. We are proposing a 70,000 square foot two story storage facility that will include a small leasing office. There will be two points of access to the site, one along the northerly property line which will access the second floor and one along the easterly property line which will access the first floor. The building will be benched into the existing slope giving a view of a one story building for the existing residential neighbors. Storm water will be handled via bio retention measures and connection into the current stormwater systems. The new structure will match the existing buildings with a dark tan and darker brown color combination. Mr. Ragone provided photographs of the site noting the existing trees for buffering and siting of the current buildings.

Mr. Toohey stated we are here merely to determine Lead Agency for SEQRA review. We are trying to provide a picture of what is being proposed. One question which arose is the district in which this property is in. It is in the T-4 zone. Under the Comprehensive Plan it is in a community mixed use zone. Mr. Toohey reviewed some comments from the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map which explained the history of how this property has become a commercial site.

Mr. Toohey reviewed the history of approvals on this property.

- Permanent Special Use Permit issued to allow outdoor storage .30 acres on October 22, 2002.
- Area variances granted from the build-to, frontage build-out and two story requirements of the T-4 to construct five additional self storage structures totaling 24,300 sq. ft. on October 22, 2003.
- DRC Architectural Review approval November 6, 2003.
- Site Plan Review approval September 8, 2004.
- A negative SEQRA declaration was issued by the Planning Board on April 24, 2013.
- Site plan modification for self storage expansion approved July 10, 2013.
- Special use permit modification for self storage facility expansion issued July 10, 2013.
- Area variances granted May 13, 2013 from the build-to, build-out and two-story requirements for construction of four single-story self storage buildings.
- SEQRA – the ZBA and DRC have pro-actively deferred SEQRA lead agency to the Planning Board.

A visual presentation of the site was provided by Mr. Toohey noting the site, which shows it as a commercial site. Mr. Toohey reviewed SEQRA points to be considered.

Mark Torpey, Chairman questioned another strategy or issues we need to look at is T-4 and the diversity of commercial use. We are putting too many eggs in one storage basket. Perhaps something else could be put here something other than storage that could maximize value. It seems that interpreting the diversity issue is something I would like to see discussed.

Mr. Toohey stated any change in use will impact on traffic which exists in this neighborhood.

Clifford Van Wagner stated way back when the neighbors were relieved when the storage facility was proposed.

Mr. Toohey continued to review the SEQRA points of review.

Discussion ensued what could be built there and traffic mitigation as well as what could be stored in these units.

Mr. Ben Aronsen stated no hazardous materials are allowed to be stored on the premises.

Amy Durland continued the discussion regarding the proposed project and what could be built there noting the requirements in the T-4 zone.

Mr. Toohey continued to refute the use and what is currently being proposed.

Mark Radden, Creighton Manning spoke concerning the report issued on November 14, 2016. Daily and hourly traffic volumes were studied both on the entrance to the storage facility and on Jones Road and Gick Road. Also studies were done on Plaza Road. The existing facility is 100,00 square feet. 28 trip generations on Saturday peak hours. The study does project an increase in 10 additional trips during the Saturday peak hour. No visible change in traffic is anticipated. A recommendation was made to improve sight distance at Gick/Plaza Drive by elimination some vegetation within 15 ft.

Mr. Toohey also reviewed the green practices which will be incorporated into this temperature controlled building.

Todd Fabozzi questioned the use of solar panels on this building.

Mr. Toohey stated this will be further investigated.

Jamin Totino stated this is the least impactful use considering the easements which exist on the property.

Janet Casey agrees with Jamin and the proposed use.

Todd Fabozzi agrees with Jamin and the proposed use.

Jamin Totino questioned the number of employees and suggested some civic space in the green space area.

Amy Durland reiterated the T-4 standards and they recommend small scale commercial uses. She cannot condone a two story storage building on this site. Perhaps some solar component to this expansive roof that would help. More significant public realm presence. She will not support this project.

Clifford Van Wagner stated he is in favor of this project.

Mark Torpey, Chairman stated we will see this at Site Plan but I do agree with Amy.

Clifford Van Wagner made a motion for the Planning Board to accept Lead Agency Status.

Jamin Totino seconded the motion.

Mark Torpey, Chairman asked if there was any further discussion.

None heard.

VOTE:

Clifford Van Wagner, in favor; Jamin Totino, in favor; Ruth Horton, alternate, in favor;
Amy Durland, in favor; Todd Fabozzi, in favor; Mark Torpey, Chairman, in favor;
Janet Casey, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 7-0

SEQRA REVIEW:

The Board reviewed Part I of the SEQRA short EAF.

The Board reviewed Part II of the SEQRA short form. No large or important areas of concern were noted.

SEQRA DETERMINATION:

Clifford Van Wagner stated that based upon the information provided by the applicant in Part I of the SEQR Full Environmental Assessment Form, and analysis of the information provided and presented in Part II of the SEQR Full Environmental Assessment Form, the project will not result in any large and important impacts and, therefore, is one that will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment. Based on this, I move to make a SEQR negative declaration for this action.

Ruth Horton, alternate seconded the motion.

Mark Torpey, Chairman asked if there was any further discussion.

Amy Durland stated she will not support this negative declaration on the basis of #1 of the SEQRA form.

VOTE:

Clifford Van Wagner, in favor; Jamin Totino, in favor; Ruth Horton, alternate, in favor;
Amy Durland, opposed; Todd Fabozzi, in favor; Mark Torpey, Chairman, in favor;
Janet Casey, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 6-1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Approval of Meeting Minutes was deferred to the January 26, 2017 meeting.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

There being no further business to discuss Mark Torpey, Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:40 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Buzanowski
Recording Secretary

APPROVED 1/26/17