



PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES (FINAL)

THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 2023

6:00 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

CALL TO ORDER: Mark Torpey, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:01 P.M.

SALUTE TO THE FLAG:

PRESENT: Mark Torpey, Chair; Mark Pingel; Vice Chair; Kerry Mayo; Chuck Marshall; Todd Fabozzi; Patty Morrison; Bill McTygue

STAFF: Susan Barden, Principal Planner, City of Saratoga Springs
Leah Everhart, Counsel to 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.

COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR:

Mark Torpey, Chair announced the agenda items to be discussed this evening. Mark Torpey, Chair, noted the applicants for #20221049, 38 Stafford Bridge Subdivision Modification have pulled their application from the meeting agenda. Mark Torpey, Chair noted that Todd Fabozzi will be recusing himself from the discussion regarding #20221027 Skidmore Construction Wellness Center. Susan Barden, Principal Planner announced that Bill McTygue is recusing himself from the first agenda item, #20220076, NYS Rt 29 Site Plan and would be joining the meeting late.

A. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

Approval of meeting minutes was deferred to the end of the meeting.

B. POSSIBLE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:

NOTE: The intent of a consent agenda is to identify any application that appear to be “approvable” without need for further evaluation or discussion. If anyone wished to further discuss any proposed consent agenda item, then that item would be pulled from the “consent agenda” and dealt with individually.

NONE AT THIS TIME

C. APPLICATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

RECUSAL:

Board Member Bill McTygue recused from the following application.

1. **#20220776 NYS Rt 29 SITE PLAN**, Second sketch site plan for a proposed multi-family residential project in the Transect - 5 (Neighborhood Center) District.

Mark Torpey, Chair, stated this is the second sketch site plan discussion. The Chair requested the applicant to provide an explanation of the slides and presentation.

Applicant: Dean DeVito – CBC Prime

Agent: James Easton, The Prime Companies

James Easton, representing Prime Companies stated that they were before the Board 3 months ago and used information and comments from that meeting to refine the vision. The presentation will touch on the major building blocks of the project and how it sits on the site to ensure they are heading in the right direction.

The orientation of all maps and drawings are such that Station Lane is along top, railroad tracks on the west, or left side and Washington is at the bottom. Zoning for the property is NC with surrounding area of mostly NC and some T-5. Submitted revisions that changed since last meeting were made due to Board request. The first is that we showed all the surface parking. Also, four buildings moved to west/railroad tracks to provide a commercial entity or space along frontage of the road to be keep existing vegetation and slope.

Made building H shaped, reduced center parking reduced by 2/3 and made a one way road around the space and added diagonal spots. Added loading zones to give tenants a place to park truck while moving in/out to keep them off the main road. Additionally, we added U-shaped road in front of each building for fire protection.

We still have center court for resident public amenities/common space; by shifting the buildings to the west, allowed for a nice sized space for resident use. The 4 H-shaped buildings allow for 338 units, 42 surface parking, most parking underground - 380 spaces.

2 story town house – 48 units with attached garage are on the outer edges of the site.

1 story commercial building 8,000 sq. ft will house maintenance supplies and extra self-storage units for tenants.

Streets 1 & 2, will have 55' right of way, two way traffic, parking, sidewalks, trees on both sides that will be on all streets all the way around. There will be a Boulevard type-street at main entrance will have 76' ROW will be dressed up with trees, landscaping. This will allow for lots of on street parking b/c of streets

Parking – 160 spots on roadway, 380 underground total 685 parking spots to include roadway, underground, garage and surface. The required parking for this site would be 588 spaces.

Bank parking available on back side of buildings for temporary parking during snow removal.

Site amenities for the residents will include pool, bocce, and gazebo. For the public, looking to connect walking trail to Station/West, seating/pergola to trailhead Station/West

The Townhouses will include 48 units, 8 pods of 6, courtyards between and the multi-family units will be in four buildings, and have 338 units. Will go through DRB for these as well.

Questions:

Mark Torpey, Chair asked Susan Barden, Principal Planner if there a need for a ZBA variance and if so, what might it be. Susan responded that there is a requirement that is not being met and asked Mr. Easton to expand. Mr. Easton explained that the variance needed is that the main principal roadway would be Washington, so the commercial and frontage build out would have to face Washington, need variance for West to be the main entrance.

Todd Fabozzi asked if the only use for the commercial building would be storage and why that choice was made. Mr. Easton explained that the reasons include there is no viable business in the early stages, and the market analysis completed showed little demand in that location due to occupancy rates in the area. Additionally, commercial space was limited because it would increase traffic. The more commercial space available, the more traffic would be clogging the roadway.

Mr. Fabozzi followed up by asking about small scale commercial space for resident use, such as a coffee shop for them to walk to. Mr. Easton, responded that maybe a limited commercial space in the corners of some of the buildings that are not shown in the drawings but can be explored.

Mr. Fabozzi brought up the previous discussions of creating a park in NE corner as well as references to a trail network that doesn't exist, stating the applicant mentioned contribution from several developments around this site and how it would be viable civic space for everyone, that there would be a bigger demand for the trail network rather than the park in the NE corner. Is the applicant suggesting a path that ends at their property? Mr. Easton answered that the Applicant will look at other ongoing projects nearby, including the possibility of creating connecting trails and trailhead parking on site and, that the Applicant would prefer to do this rather than put in civic space that will not be used. ?? Brought up the need for more than 10,000 sq. ft. of civic space for site – would the trails be in lieu of that requirement? Susan Barden responded that the requirement would need to be looked at a little differently because the trails would not be on the on the private property, that maybe we can look at linear feet of trail and quantify it that way.

Mr. Fabozzi further commented that he is in favor of the boulevard look for the main entrance.

Mr. Torpey asked about the boulevard space, and asked it be confirmed that it would only be a very small area off Station Lane. Mr. Fabozzi commented that he misread that and thinks it should go all the way to Washington. Mr. Easton replied that is certainly a possibility, and when done, all the structures have to slide to the left. Mr. Fabozzi further commented that if he removes the “useless” civic space and creates real civic space, he would have room to maneuver. Mr. Easton said he can certainly extend the boulevard through the whole project site. Patty Morrison then asked would it eliminate the civic space in that location, to which Mr. Easton replied it would reduce the space considerably, to a couple thousand square feet and the trailhead system would provide the bulk of the requirement.

Patty Morrison asked Mr. Easton to comment on the wetlands buffer and how that is being handled. Mr. Easton said there is a small pocket of wetlands in corner, as well as a ditch line that is currently roadway drainage that dumps into a large wooded area. There is a wetland through there and with the UDO code there is a buffer on either side of the ditch. Mr. Easton will look at it and quantify buffer disturbance. Mr. Easton mentioned the buffer is city requirement and that the amount of wetland being impacted would be less than 1000' sq ft, which would not require mitigation. It would require

obtaining an Army Corp of Engineers wetland permit for disturbing the existing wetland and that would be to put a culvert under the roadway and attach to Station Lane.

Mr. Torpey asked if there are any DEC jurisdictional wetlands on the site, and Mr. Easton replied that there are none on the site, that the buffer does come onto the site a little bit but they are not proposing to impact that. He further mentioned that he designed the site around the DEC buffer and kept everything out of the buffer.

Patty Morrison inquired as to a whether there will be a tree plan. Mr. Easton replied that a full landscaping plan will be submitted when these plans are approved.

Mr. Torpey commented the tree plan will need to include a survey of trees currently on site, which trees will be removed and what types of trees will be planted.

The question was raised of moving the boulevard to Washington – move townhouses 31-48 to the north could you increase greenspace in lower left hand corner and include in civic space for buildout line? You would end up with greenspace on southern side of site, and that could be counted in buildout line, so the deficiency on Washington might be addressed by inclusion of civic space.

Mr. Torpey asked Susan if the requirement is 10% or 74,000 sq ft of civic space? Yes Mr. Easton noted the quantity needed.

Mark Pingel commented that when the application comes back for site plan, would like to know what will be seen from route 29, pedestrian movement inside complex – complete plan. He also noticed on elevation plans that townhouses look like they are at ground level – UDO requires they be raised between 2-7 feet. Mr. Easton replied that yes, the renderings are just renderings, and when there is a garage, there is always a 2 foot raise from the garage into the home so they will be defaulted to meet that requirement.

Patty Morrison inquired about the height of the buildings. Mr. Easton indicated the multifamily buildings will be 4 stories and are within the height requirement of city code; the average finished grade will meet requirement. It was reiterated that the complex will have 338 apartments plus 48 townhomes.

Chuck Marshall asked about the northern side – where you front station lane – is there a small sliver of land between that and your storm water? Mr. Easton replied that is the current right of way – storm water management area and tress is either railroad property or right of way. Chuck: could you look into looking at current storm water with adjoining properties? Touching on the commercial space – could you incorporate into train station use? Easton: will talk to client

Mark Pingel commented if de-emphasizing west civic space, would be nice for those waiting for trains to have a shady space to sit.

Discussion regarding the strategy for the multiple developments in this area to work together for both civic space/parks and traffic as well. Points put forth include the pending project West/Station lane corner as well as city owned area for parkland that was part of Intrada program. Important to all get together with the Recreation Department to look at what can be designed. Intrada was just dedication of that land. Escrow needs to be addressed due to multiple applicants with different contributions, will need to manage funds effectively. Must look at feasibility of trails, whether the wetlands will need boardwalks, etc. Continued discussion regarding parking for trail heads, what parts of the lands adjoining are publicly owned, and the fact that easements already in place allow for the trails to go through.

Concern regarding underground parking was brought up due some areas have a 1 foot water table. Mr. Eason responded that the water table does vary in depth across the site, and goes 5-8 ft below, where we would put the underground would not be in the water table, not impact water tables, etc.

Suggestion to applicant was to have information regarding hydraulic connections for next meeting as well as traffic mitigation. There is a study done by previous applicant for this parcel. Sanitary/sewer could be something that needs to be addressed – cost sharing b/c pump was installed by someone else.

Todd: one last comment – would be good to have a small percentage of the units go for below market rate; allow for some units to be workforce housing. Discussion and commentary about workforce and affordable housing importance for it in this area.

Special use permit will be needed after site plan approval – may want to think about better use for commercial space rather than just storage and maintenance. Property owner in southeast corner – may be interested in selling the parcel.

No further questions or comments heard.

Mark Torpey reiterated that 38 Stafford is off the agenda.

2. #20221065 - 500 Union Ave Longfellow's Site plan review of a proposed redevelopment of the existing Longfellow's hotel, restaurant and conference center in the Interlaken PUD

Applicant: 500 Union Ave., LLC

Agent: Matt Brobston, The LA Group, PC

Mark Torpey, Chair stated this is a consideration of SEQRA lead agency status, what will be done this evening by the Board is seek to be lead agent for the review. The Board asked the applicant at the workshop to give an overview of the project to the Board of the overall concept.

Libby Careno introduced herself and the other agents working on the project, including Matt Brobston from LA Group, Brett Balzer from Balzer Tuck, Dan Mahoney Hay Creek Hotels, Sonny Bonaccio who worked on this site in 2006, and Steve Sullivan who is Longfellow's proprietor.

Aerial overview of the site shows inn is the addition on the left-hand side with original banquet facilities and restaurant. Interlaken and Regatta view are the closest residential areas to the project site. The golf club is relatively close. Ms. Careno went over a brief history of the project site starting from 1977 and the 1982 PUD of zone AA. 1998 site plan review began to change Canterbury to Longfellow's and in 2001 Longfellow's expanded to include the inn pursuant to SEQRA review and site plan amendment. In 2021, city issued zoning determination based on history of the site. In Nov 2022 applications were filed for this project.

The 2023 site plan as built was shown. Showing the last construction done on site. Existing conditions of the site were shown as photographs as well.

The proposed renovation plan was shown; red areas are going to be removed; beige areas are staying and the blue areas are the new additions. Most of the renovations will be happening in the existing footprint. The project site is zoned AA and all proposals largely match those already

approved by the Board in previous applications. Lodging, restaurant, lounge, ballroom, meeting room, pool fitness center.

The redevelopment proposal is consistent with the uses by the PUD, with no hard cap on the board for the Board on occupancy, seats, parking spaces, square footage, and number of rooms. Impacts are governed by existing record which is fairly extensive. Code enforcement found that modification of exiting site plan is required. Will also need to go to DRB for architectural review. No zoning amendment required.

Will be asking board to look at the changed conditions from original environmental findings to what is being proposed now. We will explain the differences and impacts that were not previously mitigated as part of the SEQRA review.

Building footprint square footage will have an increase in 1,600 square feet. The gross square footage will increase by about 30,000 square feet. We will review the changes. Number of restaurant seats will go down by 73, number of hotel rooms will increase by 38. Number of full time employees will increase by 5. These are the major changes from the threshold set by the PB in 1998.

Next show was the 2022 proposed amended site plan showing a bigger courtyard and an over-bridge for guests to go from one space to another without having to go outside. The 1998 plans did show a Porte cochere that was never built. No changes are proposed to the buffer area and the parking configurations.

Proposed renderings shown from 9P west, indicating most changes are to eastern façade. Back barn will stay to keep the continuity. Not many physical changes. Second rendering shown from the front of the restaurant face showing bridge between hotel and restaurant. East elevation shown to give idea of proportions and elevations. Peaks of new hotel and anchor building will be slightly higher than existing today.

First floor layout plan shown with courtyard whited out, smaller ballroom and smaller restaurant. Kitchen area stays in the same area.

Next steps SEQRA review – first request to reestablish lead agency and ask for determination for potential environmental impacts. Next step to go in front of DRB for architectural review under udo for partial demo of existing structure. Then back to PB for modification of the approved site plan based on what gets approved by DRB. Would also need to confirm the uses and area matrix modifications from the 2001 resolution.

Mark Torpey commented the Excelsior Park project had a SEQRA findings statement and the process was to amend that based on new proposal for that site. Is that document exist for this site? Ms. Careno responded that the document does exist, difference between Excelsior Park and this is this was approved due to a negative declaration statement so there is no finding statement. Excelsior Park was a positive declaration with a finding statement. The review is largely the same in that we are looking at changed conditions from the former negative declaration from a buildout site, it is there, approved and CO'd A changed conditions chart will be produced.

Patty Morrison asked it be confirmed that the applicant will be looking at how any new alterations to the site will be reevaluated for environmental impacts as they could not have been considered during the first application process. Additionally, if it is found that there are significant environmental impacts, you will go forward with SEQRA review.

Libby Careno stated they do have a letter of no impact, for the wetlands, the delineation is pending. Those would be updates from the 1998 and 2001.

Ms Careno clarified why gross square footage is increasing, but seats are decreasing; the areas of the hotel space are increasing and the banquet/restaurant space decreasing. This will allow for more on-site, longer-term stays, rather than traffic in-and-out in the same day.

Mark Pingel requested the Interlake PUD be included in submissions. Ms. Careno stated that Patrick Cogan's letter includes all the zoning records, and she will produce that letter as well as minutes from PB meetings. Will most likely be able to produce complete record.

A discussion regarding zone AA and its implications ensued; The AA zone was limited to the Canterbury area, the AA, BB and A-E zones all had different uses. The homeowners associations in Interlaken and Regatta View have met with the project members and have mostly positive responses. One concern is a comment from January 10, 2023 regarding the water table, flooding and spillover.

Further discussion regarding the 2012 Zoning Ordinance and the difference with the current UDO. The current UDO left PUDs alone; reiterated that the full list of uses for the projects site were already approved or addressed in the past.

For future meetings, the Board would like to be able to evaluate impacts; a change conditions letter would be beneficial to show the difference between what is there and what is being proposed. Additionally, traffic report will be needed; showing traffic patterns now versus how more hotel rooms but less dining will change those patterns.

Anticipation is the Board is to reprise its role as lead agency and notify the other agencies. I don't believe you have to go through the 30-day notice process nor do you need a formal motion; we can assume it and provide the appropriate notices. This will need an Architectural Review and additional DOT, DEC and IDE. May need to consider proximity to Loughberry Lake and the wells in that general area for the city's water supply. Statement made those wells are not being used due to high iron content.

No further comments or questions were heard.

3. #20221018 – 182 Excelsior Site Sketch Plan Sketch site plan review of a proposed multi-family residential project in the Urban Residential -4 (UR-4) District

Applicant: Green Springs Capital Group, LLC
Agent: Walt Lippman, MJ Engineering

Board Chair Mark Torpey announced the next project is 182 Excelsior Ave, a multi-family project this is a sketch site plan discussion for that project in the UR4 district. This is an informal conversation to share thoughts and look at plans, slides, etc.

Mike Tuck from Balzer Tuck with Walt from MJ Engineering. Mr. Tuck commented that he servers on another board where this project was discussed so he stepped out of the room to ensure no engagement with the other board and would like to just sit in on this. Also, Samantha from the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation is in attendance.

Walt Lippman started the presentation by showing the existing conditions aerial of the site; area is bounded by Excelsior Avenue on the North, Excelsior Springs on the West, Spring Run Trail on the south and the VFW parcel on the east. The parcel is located in the UR-4 Zone that is shown in blue.

The project area is outlined in the bold black line and is surrounded by institutional educational on the south which is the Spring Run Trail. To the west and North are Urban Residential; to the east the T4 Zone, a little small portion of the RR Zone in the Southeast corner and in the Northeast is T5. There are quite a few different zoning districts within the project area. The Spring Run Trail is actually an Institutional education Parkland. Mr. Lippman showed the existing conditions survey. It's a deeded 2.49 acre site with an existing house and also Carriage Barn. On the drawing shown, North is to the right; so in the Eastern portion is the carriage house and more in the center of the lot is the parking. There are two existing curb cuts; one in the northeast corner across from Veterans Way and then there's also another one right at the intersection, That one is more of a gravel entryway right at the intersection of Excelsior and Excelsior Springs Avenue. Topographically, the site basically goes from north to south and then drops off considerably to the trail in the back of the property.

The first proposed site plan is for three 12 unit apartment buildings for 36 units. We are proposing to utilize the existing curb cut on Excelsior and showing a secondary point on Excelsior Springs. Second one is not required by code, wanted to add it for ease of access. The applicant has spoken to Historic Society and is willing to explore the possibility of keeping the existing structures on site and incorporate them into the proposed development. The red dashed lines show the existing location of the house and carriage barn. This layout plan 68 parking spaces; code requires 1.5 spaces per unit and this plan has closer to 1.9 per unit.

In regard to keeping the existing structures on site, looking at a subdivision to relocate the existing Carriage House up closer to Excelsior Avenue. The structures would get new foundations and be on a parcel by themselves with 12 parking spaces. That would be 1.5 spaces per unit for the proposed eight units within those existing structures. The existing structures would have their own dedicated storm water management area and there would be shared Ingress and egress off the existing curb cut coming in off of Excelsior to get to that property.

Proposal has the three 12-unit buildings for 36 units in the back of the property. This layout would have 59 parking spaces which is about 1.6 spaces per unit.

The southwest corner shows the storm water management area. Anticipating the use of infiltration practices on the site either be a basin or underground infiltration porous pavement.

Michael from Balzer and Tuck stepped forward to speak about the historical nature of the site as well as recreating what Excelsior Ave may have looked like when this site was first created and the combination of the new proposed apartment complexes.

The project began with the goal of removing the existing structures and creating just three 12 unit buildings. After speaking with the local preservation foundation as well as the historic preservation office, it became apparent an effort to preserve those buildings was strongly encouraged. This site is not within the Architectural Review Board and our understanding is that the protections that go along with that for historic buildings are not in place.

The developer decided to make an effort to maintain those buildings and create a plan that generates needed revenue to proceed with the purchase of the property while also respecting the heritage of the buildings.

The image shown has a series of dashed lines that shows the former position of Excelsior Ave. The relationship of that road to the positioning of the house back then seems more reasonable than what exists today; it seems more traditional. The initial thought was to leave the house where it is and build

around it. But that would mean the house would sit like an island in parking lot. By moving the structures to the northeast corner of the parcel, it would become the prominent feature of this unified site. The new buildings would be towards the south. Another advantage to this is that the site slopes downward from north to south, losing about six to eight feet in grade. This helps bring some of the mass of the new buildings down relative to the older structures.

The question of viability of moving the structures was put forth. Michael responded that a structural engineer surveyed the buildings. It was determined that the porch that exists is a Porte cochere and would have to be reconstructed and the chimneys dealt with, but the structures could be moved. The interior would need to be gutted, but there was very little left of historical significance due to different changes made over the years. The structures, once moved and renovated would continue to be apartments, with the goal being to make it condos which would be privately owned. The main motivation for relocating it and subdividing the lot is so that there could be an HOA and a condo establishment for this corner parcel that didn't have to encumber the apartments.

The new parcel would have the moved existing house and carriage barn. The existing house would have six units and the carriage house would have two units. The carriage barn would be a second principal structure because it would have full livable dwelling units. The goal is to have six dwelling units in the house and two dwelling units in the carriage barn. The zoning allows for two principal structures on the lot.

The total acreage would be 2.49 with the 12 spaces for the eight units making it 1.5 spaces per unit. The parcel with the existing house and barn will be subdivided away from the apartments.

These plans will create a density problem and we will have to ask for increased density. Part of the need for the increased density is associated with the costs of relocating and preserving the existing buildings. Continued discussion regarding density; current plan is at about 16 units per acre which is only slightly more than the underlying comp plan of 15 units an acre. May only need density bonus for some of the buildings, not all. The relocated structures would be compliant with just more than 3,000 square feet of land per dwelling unit.

Discussion regarding the alignment of the buildings in relation to the roads as well as how to position the buildings on the lot to be more compliant to the zoning. Board suggested having options in case those variances are not approved. Different suggestions of alignment were put forth. The importance of the two existing structures discussed, whether both have equal importance. Need to keep the same look in the area was discussed, moving the existing structure closer to the street edge with the new buildings set further back, obscured by trees. Suggestions and comments regarding access in the proposal and how to improve it; adding a second driveway onto Excelsior Spring. May want to use the existing traffic lights to your advantage.

Suggestion was made to get an advisory opinion from the DRB early in the process.

Patty Morrison asked if there was anything on record from the Preservation Foundation regarding these structures. Samantha Bosshart from the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation was introduced and asked to speak regarding the property. Samantha gave an overview of the history: the father of Henry Lawrence purchased this property in 1829. It was the valley of ten springs and he develop it as Excelsior Park. He owned land from Loughberry Lake all the way to Lake Avenue and plotted it out as a garden suburb. The carriage house is from the same time evidenced by the same Gothic Revival Architectural style. The importance of this Gothic Revival style is there are only two examples of that style in our city. Equally important is how Henry Lawrence sold the land to the Village of Saratoga to develop the water works and Loughberry Lake for the reservoir.

The home retains a high degree of integrity despite some of the rear insensitive additions and the Carriage House has still retains its decorative patterned slate roof, chimneys and so many character defining features of the style. The home remained in the Lawrence Family until 1948.

The property is very important, historically, both due to the architectural style of the buildings as well as the people who lived there. The SSPF would fully opposed demolition of the buildings, and would strongly suggest DRB involvement regarding renovations to the interiors if they are moved.

Ms. Bosshart passed out a brochure talking about his Excelsior Park and the development of the water including a map and illustrated images.

The Board discussed next steps for the applicant and the authority the Planning Board has to impose conditions. It was agreed the Planning Board does have the authority to impose reasonable conditions especially since question 10 on the long form, part two of the eaf looks for impact on historic and archaeological resources. Additionally, subsection D also asks about other impacts and the DRB would be a good resource to do the SEQRA review when we get the full application.

Chuck Marshall commented that considering the importance of the look of the buildings it's very important to make sure the new buildings match. Would like to be on the side of saving architecture in the community. This would be a great opportunity to save historic buildings and provide needed additional rental residential space.

Patty Morrison then questioned the necessity of the density being proposed. The applicant responded that the density being proposed would amount to 2500 square feet per unit rather than 3000 square feet. Ms. Morrison further expressed concern that the units will all look cramped, and all the work done to keep the existing structures will get lost. Discussion followed that it is hard to make judgments about how it will look without elevation plans, drawings, etc.

Discussion and comments on next steps ensued, confirming the SEQRA review will need to be done first, involving the DRB due to the "other impacts" portion of the long form. Additionally, the applicant will need to supply elevations and perspective drawings and 3D models if possible. The Planning Board will reach out to the DRB for any questions, needed information, etc. they would need to make an advisory opinion. Additionally, Samantha Bosshart from Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation will submit information to the DRB to help them determine their needs. The applicant would have this information when they come back for a second sketch review. If possible the Planning Board will meet with the Design Review Board regarding this project.

No further comments or questions were heard.

4. 20221027 Skidmore Construction Wellness Center Site plan review of a new 75,400 sq.ft. Wellness, fitness and tennis center and associated site work in the Institutional-Education (INST-ED) District.

Todd Fabozzi recused himself from this portion of the meeting.

Applicant: Skidmore College
Agent: Don McPherson , The LA Group, PC

Don McPherson from the LA Group introduced himself as well as Dan Rodecker from Skidmore College and Caitlin Mayo also from LA Group.

This project is almost identical project was approved by this board in 2020. There are very few changes to the outside; the project expired due to the uncertainty of everything during 2020.

The project is located on the Skidmore campus, in the southern portion, that is generally known as the athletic precinct of the campus. The specific site is adjacent to Williamson Athletic Facility. Initially, the Greenberg daycare center would be in the center of a ring of athletic buildings. The Greenberg daycare center was moved to a new building and that opened up space in that vicinity to improve and expand the functionality. We were able to look not just at physical, athletic health but mental wellness as well. Because the daycare facility had its own parking, there will be about 27 pre-existing parking spaces, which would be more than what would have been needed for the center itself. Additionally, without the Greenberg building, the tennis courts now have a little more space for spectators.

The fire lane and existing storm water basin are the same as the 2020 plan. Changes to both State St. to the east and residents to the south are very similar if not identical. The zoning for a side setback is 12 feet, and we are at 23 feet, well beyond the minimum.

For storm water drainage, again the plan is identical to what was approved. East of the tennis courts and east of the new building are some pre-treatment basins that discharge to a chain of existing storm water treatment basins. There are three of them that step down towards Clement Street and discharge to the city storm sewer. That plan was submitted to the town the city designated engineer, and the plan has already been approved. They had a few procedural comments.

Discussion about potential other storm water ideas followed. Skidmore has shallow bedrock; an issue they've been dealing with for years. Skidmore took steps separate from this plan to improve the drainage along North Broadway. They have been quite cognizant of their responsibility about their storm water.

Mr. McPherson continued detailing the site plan, pointing out pedestrian access routes and parking availability. Pointing out the abundance of easy access parking for multiple events when necessary due to the absorption of the spaces from Greenberg.

The presentation continued with the Landscaping plan. There will be screen plantings along the Loop Road, trees along the new walk and landscaping between the building and the tennis courts and revised landscaping along the entry walk coming down towards Williamson. As part of the entry sign project that didn't need site plan approval, Skidmore is planning to line North Broadway with shade trees as part of their improvements. In addition to the 140 evergreen, flowering and deciduous trees planted as part of this project, Skidmore is willing to commit to planting another 50 trees on campus before we get a certificate of occupancy because the importance trees are to both the city and Skidmore.

Another improvement presented was the lighting on campus. Skidmore will be using the same LED light system that was used in the conversion of Wachenheim Stadium. The LED lighting will illuminate eight courts with less spilling glare. The lighting for the pedestrian approach walks and backs of the buildings will be security level lighting. The lighting was considered from a few perspectives.

The schematics of the buildings was presented and discussed. Review of placement of the indoor court location relative to lockers rooms, parking and expanded health and wellness functions. The

health services and counseling center moving will open up desperately needed residence hall space. Another benefit to this master plan is that the current athletic center is geared for Varsity Athletes, but the new additions are designed so that the general student will have a space to go work out and not feel intimidated by The Varsity athletes.

Presentation continued with an artist rendering from the view from the tennis courts to show the landscape strip between the courts and the building. Also shown was a view from Clement Street, showing the top facade is the 2020 architectural façade of that south face.

The sustainability of the entire project was presented. This building project will be considered LEED Silver certified. Skidmore already utilizes geothermal heating and that will be expanded to serve this building. Electric vehicle charging stations will be installed in the reclaimed parking lot, the shared parking cuts out the need to build another lot. LED lighting will be pedestrian lights will meet the maximum pole height of 20 feet. There will be no impact on that the southern property line along the city park. A row of trees will be added along the north side of the north side Civic Park. There are some already there, but it will be extended. The CO2 footprint per square foot is not a typical calculation and requires an extra fee and will unfortunately not be available. All the new materials coming into the building will be will have a certain recycled content, any demolition debris will be recycled to the fullest extent possible, construction packaging will be recycled and Skidmore will implement their campus-wide recycling program into this new building as well.

Discussion points brought up were that the offsite solar array and hydro provide 17- 20 percent towards needed energy. Skidmore has adopted an internal construction policy for sustainability in that any new building over five million dollars and any renovation over two million dollars is required to be LEED certified. Additionally, any renovation or building costing less that that must still follow LEED guidelines and we internally track it. Contractors are required to track all the waste going out at the end of the project as well. The cost of the project as is exists now is \$35.5 million.

Further discussion about storm water and how Skidmore does have winter maintenance plans for the basins to ensure they are functioning properly. Storm water maintenance is another aspect of being LEED certified. Discussion of previous work regarding storm water maintenance continued.

Reiteration and confirmation of landscaping plan – there will be a mix of species so there will be diversity among the trees lining both sides from the cul-de-sac at the North End of North Broadway down to Fourth Street. There will be 50 trees put in there.

Discussion regarding the necessity of the long or short SEQRA form, whether the proposed plans will result in any different environmental impacts versus the approved plans from 2020. Idea was raised that the changes in the plan provide for a better environmental situation.

Chuck made a motion that no new or different impacts are to result from this application that were not previously considered by this Board.

Motion carries.

For the site plan we want to identify the tree planting on our notice of decision as well as the LEED silver certification.

Motion to approve the site plan as provided with the two conditions.

Motion seconded.

Motion carries.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

There being no further business to discuss the meeting was adjourned at 9:03 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Destino

Minutes approved April 13, 2023