

PLANNING BOARD MEETING - MAY 21, 2018
CALLED TO ORDER BY: CHAIRWOMAN DENISE MAYRER AT 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT

Wayne Johnson, P.E. acting chair
John LaVoie
Lawrence D'Angelo
Andrew Aubin, P.E.
James Shaughnessy, P.E.
Paul Puccio
Nadine Fuda, Director
Attorney Craig Crist, Esq.
Richard Laberge, P.E. Planning Board Engineer
Melissa Knights, Assistant to the Planning Director

MEMBERS ABSENT

Denise Mayrer, Chairwoman

APPROVAL OF MINUTES — MAY 7, 2018

Johnson moved, LaVoie seconded that the minutes be approved as amended.

6 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Aubin, D'Angelo, Johnson, LaVoie, Mayrer, Puccio, Shaughnessy

Oppose: None

Mr. Johnson stated he had some changes and he wanted to ask Mr. Laberge if he agreed that the following be added to page 38 of the minutes about the mounted light poles, and that the 40 foot poles were greater than allowed by town code

Mr. Laberge stated that he is not sure he made that statement, he talked about the pole height being a potential concern and that shorted poles might be better but then there might be more of them.

Mr. Johnson stated then shorted poles maybe better should be added to the minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no comments from the public.

Recommendation to ZBA

Jason Laurenzo/Amanda Melino
22 Estate Drive
Proposed - Area Variance

Z774-18/R-20/189.-1-1.112

Jason Laurenzo, applicant was present for this meeting,

Mr. Laurenzo stated he is looking to put on a 20 x 48 foot addition that will impede into the side yard setback; the addition will consist of a bedroom, bathroom and a closet.

Mr. Johnson asked about the sketch, it doesn't show the dimensions and we really don't know what the new setback is going to be. He request that on the plans be adjusted to include the distance to the property line. He did calculated the distance and it's approximately 16 feet from the property line. You will need to stake out the actual room size for variance board to see and do the actual measurement.

Mr. Shaughnessy asked if this is also exceeds the 10% coverage or is it just a sideyard issue.

Mrs. Fuda stated no.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ZBA

Puccio moved, LaVoie seconded a **"FAVORABLE"** recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

6 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Aubin, D'Angelo, Johnson, LaVoie, Puccio, Shaughnessy

Oppose: None

Change in Tenancy

Chasity Burl Massage Therapy

2018/HC/211.-3-8.11

3500 US Rt. 20

Proposed - Change in Tenancy

Chasity Burl, applicant was present for this meeting.

Ms. Burl stated she is a NYS license massage therapist, her current location is in Nassau. She is looking to move for better exposure and for easy access for her clients.

Mr. Puccio asked about the parking, the previous tenant didn't need parking only for the employees, and asked if she would need more that what is existing.

Ms. Burl stated the call center required more parking then what she is going to need, it is just her and one or two clients.

Mr. Johnson asked about the septic and if there were going to be any issues,

Ms. Burl stated no,

CHANGE IN TENANCY

D'Angelo moved, LaVoie seconded APPROVAL of a change in tenancy at "3500 US Rt.9"

6 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Aubin, D'Angelo, Johnson, LaVoie, Puccio, Shaughnessy

Oppose: None

Site Plan /Special Permit

Robert Scannell / Scannell Properties

2018-11/PD3/200.-6-1.3 & 200.-6-22.1

US Rt. 9

Proposed - Distribution Center

Steve Boisvert, McFarland Johnson, Inc., Daniel Madrigal, Scannell Properties applicant and Ben Mueller from Ostergaard Acoustical Associates were present for this meeting.

Mr. Boisvert spoke about the changes to the site plan and the following.

- The Laberge Letter dated May 17, 2018 (see below)
- Environmental assessment report containing over 900 pages (see file) which included the following.
- The noise study
- Traffic study
- Wetlands
- Archaeological
- Impact on land, water, stormwater, drainage and the aquifer.
- Lighting, the height of the parking lot poles and the type of the lighting.
- The 18 foot noise wall that sits on a 14 foot height embankment along the south side, by Hillcrest.
- Presented several photo simulations of different points of view of the site, building, parking, screening, landscaping, the wall and the adjoining properties.
- Architectural changes made were, north elevation from the employee parking lot did not change, and they did however improve the south elevation where the truck docks are located and brought the color scheme to this side as well.

NOTE: all the above were uploaded to the Town of Schodack website. www.schodack.org.

Mr. Aubin asked about the light polls and if they were the standard 25 foot in height,

Mr. Boisvert stated yes they are 25 feet high in the employee parking lot and 40 in the rear of the building.

Mr. Johnson asked if the canopy on the right hand side is an entrance.

Mr. Boisvert stated no it is there to break up the elevation.

Mr. Johnson asked about the horizontal dark and light lines and if the front are windows for offices, the same shows on the back of the building towards I90.

Mr. Boisvert stated he will check the floor plans and get back to him.

Mr. Puccio asked Mr. Laberge about an item in his letter (page 5 of 7) regarding trucks crossing multiple lanes, and item **#9 "The applicant should consider requesting a second traffic light for the truck entrance and coordinating the two signals"** his question is if DOT did not agree to a traffic light would they consider a merge lane for any traffic heading south on Rt.9 out of the truck exit. The reason he raises this question the experience at Pilot with the exit the trucks at times take up both south bound lanes and the center turning lane to exit the site. He is looking to avoid that issue with this project.

Mr. Laberge spoke about roman numeral 5 and 6 that is was just an interpretation of site distance analysis, he didn't think they used the proper value for the trucks coming across the number of lanes, not saying they are wrong he is just making sure things are correct and true in the report. As for your suggest he is looking at the turn radius so that is not an issue, and DOT will be looking at that as well. He understands the concern and will make sure they follow through.

Mr. Laberge spoke about his letter and they have gone through the environmental assessment form that was submitted and there is some work to be done to get that corrected, which is comment number 13 of his letter dated May 17, 2018 (see below)

Mr. Johnson asked about page 1 item number 3 - see below

3. A 2- lot subdivision application with a lot line adjustment is required to adjust the boundary line between the parcels as shown in the drawings

He has not seen the subdivision application and was wondering one would be required.

Mr. Laberge stated yes they will be submitting the paperwork before the next meeting.

Mr. Boisvert stated they are going to be withdrawing that application because the land owner is no longer keeping the house and extra acreage.

Mr. Johnson asked if they thought they were ready to schedule a public hearing.

Mr. Boisvert stated yes they are ready for a June 4, 2018 public hearing.

Mr. Johnson asked the board if they had any issues with this request.

There were no objections from the board.

Mr. Johnson stated he wanted to thank the applicant for responding and acting on the

comments from the last meeting, he thinks this will be a better project for ever body in town.

Mrs. Fuda stated that the plans, environmental assessment binder, and the file are in the planning office Monday through Friday 8:30 to 4:00, they will not be available on Saturday when the Town Clerk is open. And all the above has been uploaded to the Town of Schodack website. If you have any questions please come into the office or call.

Laberge Letter Dated May 17, 2018

Preliminary Site Plan and SEQR Review
Scannell Site Plan
SPB No. 2018-11
Town of Schodack Planning Board

We are in receipt of a set of plans and an Environmental Assessment Report dated April 27, 2018 and a Full Environmental Assessment Form signed April 3, 2018 for the above referenced project and offer the following conceptual comments:

1. The project is located in a PD3 zone and is a permitted use as a Sales Distribution Center in that zone. The project is located on two parcels comprising 116± acres, which is greater than the minimum lot area of ten acres. Site plan approval is required.
2. The project is a permitted use under the Town of Schodack's Water Quality Control Act. A special permit is required. Use is subject to the conditions of §223-6C (1) and §223-8.
3. A 2- lot subdivision application with a lot line adjustment is required to adjust the boundary line between the parcels as shown in the drawings.
4. Extension of Consolidated Water District No. 101 and a sewer district to be determined to include the parcels is required. A request should be submitted to the Town Board.
5. A description of the products inside the building should be submitted.
6. The project should confer with all emergency services with primary responsibility for the site to solicit their comments on the proposed plan. Emergency services should be asked to comment on their capacity to serve the proposed project and whether those services believe any additional training is required. Comments should be requested in writing (email is acceptable).
7. The applicant should identify areas to remain natural on the overall site layout plan. A note should be added that the site will not be further developed or subdivided.
8. A five year performance bond is required by the applicant to ensure that plantings survive and natural areas are properly maintained.
9. A park land fee of \$1,000 will be due at the time of the site plan approval.
10. The Applicant has proposed to convey wastewater to the existing sewer system north of the site which is eventually pumped to East Greenbush for treatment under contract. While the projected wastewater volume is expected to decrease to 6,000 gpd, the contract with the Town of East Greenbush still has limited capacity remaining. Therefore, the Applicant should analyze pumping sanitary wastewater south to the proposed pump station on Maple Hill Road near the Schodack Central School District Campus.
11. A NYSDOT Work Permit will be required. As such, coordination with that agency should be initiated and the Traffic Impact study forwarded to them as well.
12. A narrative construction plan for the proposed project should be submitted which identifies the hours of operation and a schedule of activities by time of day in the areas adjacent to the

residential neighbors including grading/site construction and building construction. The plan should also incorporate specific actions to be taken regarding noise, lighting, dust, mud, etc.

13. We offer the following comments on the Full Environmental Assessment Form submitted. The following revisions should be made:

- a) Completion of all items marked "TBD"
- b) C.2.b Project is located in Hudson River Greenway area.
- c) C.4.a School District is East Greenbush Central School District.
- d) D.1.a The general nature of the proposal action should be described as commercial.
- e) D.2.b This question should be answered "yes" even if the wetlands being affected are non-jurisdictional. This can be explained below the response.
- f) D.2.c.ii The water district to be extended Consolidated Water District No. 202.
- g) D.2.c.iii Source of supply should be amended to indicate well field.
- h) D.2.d.iii Name of District should be identify as No. 6.
- i) D.2.f Modify answer to "yes" and provide detail below.
- j) D.2.j Provide answer.
- k) D.2.j.vi This question is answered "yes". Identify what services are within ½ mile of the site.
- l) D.2.l.i Identify proposed construction hours for all categories by clock hours.
- m) D.2.m.i Discuss increase in noise levels during operations and amount of increase.
- n) D.2.n.i The response needs to indicate the height of fixtures and proximity to nearest occupied structures.
- o) D.2.p Answer should be modified to incorporate storage of liquid hydrogen.
- p) E.1.b Areas should include wetlands even if they are non-jurisdictional.
- q) E.2.b.1 The site is located entirely in the Schodack Terrace aquifer and is not adjacent to the Valatiekill aquifer.
- r) E.3.b The site contains highly productive soils w/classification CbA, HoA and HoB.

14. Regarding the Expanded Assessment we have the following comments:

- a) A noise study is required.
- b) Section I/A Are there any Saturday or Sunday operations?
- c) Section II/B
 - i) The amount of soil import/export should be clarified as there appears to be conflicting information. Please quantify the amount of materials to be imported (gravel, stone, etc.) and to be exported (topsoil, poor material, etc.).
 - ii) How much rock will be removed?
 - iii) Will blasting be utilized for rock removal?
- d) Pages 9 & 10
 - i) The water district to be extended will be Consolidated District #101 (CWD101).
 - ii) Current usage of the Town Well Field is 130,000 gpd on average.
 - iii) Capacity of the Town Well field is currently 0.5 MGD until additional improvements are installed.
 - iv) Waste water flows are projected based upon a similar sized facility. Please provide location, historical employment data, number of shifts data in order analyze the validity of the comparison.
 - v) The site will be parking more than 100 cars, five days per week, and will require the installation of oil/water separators in stormwater systems.
- e) Page 1

- i) LED lighting is proposed. The Planning Board has requested the be between 2700k and 3000k.
 - ii) The luminere of the lighting should be shielded below the level of the fixture to reduce the potential for source glare.
 - iii) all mounting heights should be reduced by approximately 25% to reduce the potential for source glare.
- f) Page 16
 - i) The applicant should analyze the impacts on the intersection of US Rt .9and Richwood Dr. and the impact on the Exit 11 intersection from the WB off ramp and the EB on ramp.
 - ii) A similar facility is cited in this section. Please provide details in order
 - iii) to verify the validity of the comparison.
 - iv) The site distance table will require revision per our comments on the Traffic Impact Study.
- g) Page 20
 - Provide verification of National Grid's electric and gas capacity or their intent to do so.
- h) Soils/Borings
 - i) In order to utilize infiltration, the depth to groundwater/bedrock must be verified to be at least 3' below the floor of the facility.
 - ii) Infiltration tests are needed for each area to be used for infiltration.
- j) Visual
 - i) The applicant should consider presenting the section views profiles at a Horiz : 1 Vertical scale to help the public better understand the relative elevations.
 - ii) The analysis indicates the structure will be visible from I-90. Additional screening to break up the view from that location should be proposed.
 - iii) Additional architectural relief of and landscaping to screen the eas elevation is required.
 - iv) Details of the sign along US Route 9 are required including whether they will be lit or not.
 - v) Photo simulations should be provided from key vantage points:
 - A. Julianne Drive
 - B. Richwood Drive/Star Terrace
 - C. N. Hillcrest Road
 - D. I-90 East bound and West bound
 - E. US Rt. 9 North bound and South bound
- j) Stormwater
 - i. Provide a detailed erosion and sediment control plan that includes temporary measures required during formation of the site grades.
 - ii. A Notice of Intent and SWPPP is required to be submitted including all maintenance agreements.
 - iii. Indicate the location of concrete wash outs and provide details for the same as well as a sign detail for the washout area.
 - iv. The stone construction exit should be extended to twice the indicated length based upon the soils and expected construction traffic.
 - v. A stock pile of erosion and sediment control measures should be maintained on the site and indicated on the plans.

- vi. The location for and method of storage of petroleum products and other chemicals on the site during construction should be indicated to prevent stormwater becoming contaminated.
- vii. Do to the number of vehicles parked redundant pretreatment lined with an impermeable membrane is required for the stormwater management infiltration basins.
- viii. The Profiles and sections for the fore bays and infiltration basins should be provided and indicate WQv depth/elevations, 1-yr, 10-yr and 100-yr maximum stages.
- ix. The infiltration basins are required to dewater within 48 hours and should be so noted on the profiles/details.
- x. Drywells connected by perforated pipe required in the infiltration basins in case of frozen ground conditions.
- xi. The post stormwater management facilities should be provided with the required signage per the NYSDEC stormwater design manual. They should also be equipped with a sediment depth gage and notes indicating when maintenance is required.
- xii. Access for maintenance to and into all fore bays and infiltration basins is required.

k) Traffic

- i) The traffic data collection section of the TIS states that the 2018 traffic count data were compared and balanced to ensure consistency and accuracy. After a review of Figure 4 – 2018 Existing Traffic Volumes, the traffic volumes do not seem to be balanced throughout all the study area intersections.
- ii) The trip generation data for the proposed distribution center was based/obtained from an “identical sales distribution facility”. The applicant provided little to no information regarding the specific source of the identical sales distribution facility used for this study. While the information provided in Appendix B seems to be fitting to use for this specific traffic analysis, more specific information about the existing facility should be provided.
- iii) The trip generation section of the TIS narrative states that the projected truck traffic will be 15 to 30 trips during the daytime hours and 0 to 15 trips during the evening hours. Table 1 – Trip Generation Table shows it differently, with higher truck trips during the evening hours. The applicant should provide more specific information regarding the daytime and evening time frame hours to avoid any confusion compared to the peak hour information provided in trip generation table.
- iv) Figure 7 – Trip Generation Traffic Volumes (AM), seems to have some errors on several traffic volumes shown at the employee driveway access. Even though the difference in volumes do not seem to affect the results of the future level of services, the information will need to be corrected in the traffic figure and any other figures throughout the TIS that would need corrections.
- v) The AASHTO recommended sight distance measurements used for the sight distance analysis are not the correct measurements needed for this analysis. The applicant seems to use the recommended measurements for passenger vehicles crossing a single lane. At the location of the proposed

driveways, the vehicles will be crossing multiple lanes, therefore the measurements for the “2-lanes” vehicular crossing should be used instead.

- vi) Regarding the sight distance analysis at the proposed truck driveway access, incorrect AASHTO recommended sight distance measurements were used in the TIS. The applicant should use the AASHTO recommended truck sight distance measurement for multiple lane crossing. Based on the available sight distance measurements shown in Table 5 – Sight Distance Summary Table, the sight distance at the truck driveway does not meet Intersection Sight Distance standard for the posted speed limit of 55 mph.
- vii) The traffic study suggests that at the employee driveway access, the existing center two-way left turn lane be re-stripped to provide a dedicated northbound left turn lane into the site. The applicant should analyze and discuss the potential queuing that could impact traffic traveling along US Route 9.
- viii) The US Rt 9 southbound right turn movement is substantial. The applicant should consider a southbound, dedicated turn lane into the employee driveway.
- ix) The applicant should consider requesting a second traffic light for the truck entrance and coordinating the two signals.

Regarding the plans, we offer the following comments:

- 15) #GN – 01 i) The sequence of Construction notes need to be reviewed for applicability to this project.
- 16) Lot Line i) all “new” lot lines should be in bold.
- Adjustment Survey ii) show previous lot sizes in smaller font for reference.
- 17) Layout Plan i) Islands in automobile parking area should be curbed and landscaped with drought resistant trees.
- ii) Crosswalks in the automobile parking lot should continue to the building at the center and west end of the building.
- iii) Given the angle parking, directional pavement markings are required to reduce “wrong way” traffic.
- iv) On site stop signs should be installed at the end of long parking isles and at other appropriate locations.
- v) An area speed limit of 15 MPH should be set for the site and signed.
- vi) Details of the hydrogen fueling station are needed for further review.
- vii) The trash compactor should be screened from any view from Rt. 9.
- viii) A prominent note should be added indicating no outdoor storage or display is allowed.
- ix) Truck turning radii should be outlined on the plan for the truck entrance.
- x) A retaining wall detail is needed.
- 18) Grading Plan Stormwater forebays must be lined to be impervious. A detail is also required.
- 19) Utility i) A backflow preventer is needed on the water supply near the master meter.
- ii) The 12” water main should be extended to the southern extents of the project parcel and a hydrant installed with a terminal valve and cap.

- iii) The Town desires to own the wastewater pump station for the facility pending the completion of your analysis of pumping wastewater south towards Maple Hill Road.
- 20) Details
 - i) A bollard detail is shown. The applicant should clarify where bollards are to be used.
 - ii) Details of the signs at the entrances should be provided.
 - iii) Is any building signage proposed? If so, will it be lit? A detail should be provided if the building will have signage.
- 21) Lighting
 - i) The lighting plans should specify a K value between 2700k and 3000k.
 - ii) The fixture detail should indicate glare shields extending below the luminere.
 - iii) We assume the "MH" value is mounting height. Clarify if it is from ground or top of foundation which is 30" off finished grade. Also specify of south side of building mounted height is from finished floor or outside ground elevations.
 - iv) While more lights will be needed, the mounting heights of the building and pole mounted lights should be reduced to 25' and 34' respectively.
- 22) Landscaping Plan
 - i) A plan for the entire site is needed.
 - ii) The entrance should be enhanced with planting islands wide enough to sustain suitable plantings.
 - iii) Landscape plans for the monument signage needed.
 - iv) Drought resistant street trees should be added to landscaped islands in the automobile parking lot.
- 23) Offsite Water Plans
 - i) Details of the crossing under NYSDOT right of ways are needed.
 - ii) The pipe type should be identified on the plan.
 - iii) Valves will be necessary every 600' or as required by RCDOH.
- 24) Sewer Pump Station
 - i) Considerations should be made to making this a municipal pump station for future use by the Town with appropriate easements.
 - ii) Backup power is necessary for operation during power outages.
 - iii) Design calculations for the 12" gravity sewer should be provided to show there is adequate volume of flow.

We recommend the Applicant incorporate changes regarding the above in their next submission. We will continue to review the information as received.

MEMBER DISCUSSION

None

ADJOURN

Puccio moved, D'Angelo seconded that the Planning Board meeting be adjourned. There being no objections, Chairwoman Mayrer adjourned the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
 Nadine Fuda
 Director of Planning & Zoning