

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

Town of Glenville

18 Glenridge Road

Glenville, NY 12302

May 13, 2019

Present: M. Carr, Chairman, N. Brower Dobiesz, J. Lippmann, P. Ragucci,
M. Tanner, K. Semon

Also

Attending: M. Burns, Planner I, Arnie Briscoe, Code Enforcement Office,
M. Cuevas, Town Attorney

Absent: J. Gibney

Meeting called to order at 7:00 P.M.

Motion to approve the Agenda

Moved by: K. Semon

Seconded by: P. Ragucci

Ayes: 6 **Noes:** 0 **Absent:** 1

Motion Approved

Motion to approve minutes from the April 8, 2019 meeting

Moved by: P. Ragucci

Seconded by: M. Tanner

Ayes: 5 **Noes:** 0 **Absent:** 1 **Abstention:** 1 Committee member was absent from the April meeting.

Motion Approved

**Highbridge Development Airport SP, LLC
21 Airport Road**

**Minor Subdivision
(Preliminary)**

This subdivision application involves the purchase of approximately 6.7+/- acres of decommissioned airport property from Schenectady County along Airport Road. The purpose of this subdivision is to construct an 87,000 sq. ft. manufacturing facility with offices. The property is zoned “Research / Development / Technology”.

Jamie Easton, MJ Engineering, represented the applicant.

J. Easton stated that Highbridge Development is purchasing 6.7 acres from the Schenectady County Airport for the proposed building site and future development which meets current Town Code requirements for building area and density. Originally the parcel was bisected between two zoning classifications, “Airport” and “Research/Development/Technology”. The parcel was recently rezoned and is now one zoning classifications R/D/T.

The Commission had no comments regarding this application.

MOTION

In the matter of the preliminary minor subdivision application by Highbridge Development Airport SP, LLC for a minor subdivision located at 21 Airport Road, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby approves the preliminary application.

The Commission hereby schedules a public hearing for June 10, 2019 to consider the final minor subdivision application. However, in order for the Commission to schedule a public hearing for June 10, 2019, nine (9) copies of the revised subdivision map and/or requested information must be submitted to the Town of Glenville Planning Department no later than 14 calendar days prior to the public hearing.

Motion

Moved by: M. Carr

Seconded by: P. Ragucci

Ayes: 5 **Noes:** 0 **Absent:** 1 **Abstention:** 1 Potential conflict of interest: Applicant represented by member’s engineering firm.

Motion Approved

**Highbridge Development Airport SP, LLC
21 Airport Road**

**Site Plan Review
(Preliminary)**

The Site Plan application involves construction of a 47,600 sq. ft. manufacturing facility with offices, ancillary parking, landscaping and stormwater management practices on approximately 6.7+/- acres of

decommissioned airport property. A second phase will include an approximately 40,000 sq. ft. addition to the original building. The property is zoned “Research/Development/Technology”.

Jamie Easton, MJ Engineering, again represented the applicant.

J. Easton said the Town has received additional documentation on the wetlands, containers, products used in the manufacturing process, storm water management report, and a complete set of construction drawings. The original phase is the 47,000 sq. ft. building with a future addition in the back. J. Easton quickly reviewed the new drawings with the Commission. The only comment the applicant has received was from Schenectady County regarding the layout designs i.e. the extension of the parking lot and the tractor trailer loading area.

K. Semon inquired if Schenectady County offered any reasoning for their comments. Additionally, he asked if only one row or two rows of parking will be built.

J. Easton replied they only received a sketch. Initially there will only be one row of parking. The second row will be added with the future addition.

M. Carr asked J. Easton to address the chemical storage on site.

J. Easton said currently the storage will be to the south of the existing building and it will be outside. He referred to the site plan showing where the storage tanks with a fenced enclosure will be located. Additionally, there is an approximate 10’x10’ area where the oxygen source tanks will be stored.

D. Schlansker stated the chemicals are stored inside just within the loading dock area.

M. Carr asked if there will be any hazardous materials stored outside.

J. Easton answered there won’t be any hazardous materials stored outside.

M. Carr asked if the asbestos and lead paint testing results have been received.

D. Schlansker replied the results were received today, 5/13/19, and he provided Chairman Carr copies of the results. They are waiting for a final summary.

M. Carr asked if a plan has been put together for emergency responders or if communication with local providers has been established. He suggested the applicant get in touch with the local fire chiefs and whoever is responsible at the airport.

M. Carr asked if proper disposal of the demolition waste has been addressed.

D. Schlansker said they have contracted with Jackson Demolition to take the building down and a separate company to address the asbestos issue.

MOTION

In the matter of the preliminary site plan review application by Highbridge Development Airport SP, LLC for the construction of a 47,000 sq. ft. manufacturing facility with offices, ancillary parking, landscaping and stormwater management practices located at 21 Airport Road, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby conditionally approves the application.

Conditions of preliminary approval are as follows:

1. The asbestos and lead investigation report need to be finalized and the applicant is to follow the recommendations of the report for the appropriate handling and disposal of said material.
2. The applicant is to meet or correspond with the local fire chiefs i.e. Thomas Corners, Airport, East Glenville Fire Departments to communicate the nature and type of materials that are at the facility in case of an emergency/fire.
3. The applicant will properly dispose of the demolition debris of the existing building.

The Commission hereby schedules a public hearing for June 10, 2019 to consider the final site plan review application for this particular project. However, in order for the Commission to schedule a public hearing for June 10, 2019, nine (9) copies of the revised site plan must be submitted to the Town of Glenville Planning Department no later than 14 calendar days prior to the public hearing date.

MOTION

Moved by: M. Carr

Seconded by: P. Ragucci

Ayes: 5 **Noes:** 0 **Absent:** 1 **Abstention:** 1 Potential conflict of interest: Applicant represented by member's engineering firm.

Motion Approved

**Mohawk Honda Site Plan Modification
(Monarch Design Group, LLC & JAG 1, LLC)
175 Freemans Bridge Road**

**Site Plan Review
(Preliminary) &
Conditional Use Permit
Recommendation**

This Site Plan application involves the demolition of the former First Niagara bank building and construction of a 10,170 sq. ft. auto detail bay building, containing nine (9) detail lift bays, two (2) wet, service fit-up bays, and one (1) photo bay. A second 2,880 sq. ft. structure will house a two (2) bay drive-thru car wash available to Mohawk Honda clients only. Ancillary features include landscaping, parking areas, and stormwater management practices. The new facilities are considered accessory to the principal auto dealership land use, therefore a Conditional Use Permit is also required. The property is zoned "General Business".

Ed Esposito, Monarch Design Group, LLC, was present. He mentioned this has been an on-going review and the last few meetings have addressed architectural reviews, the easement with Oliver's Café and the building heights. He addressed the handouts that the Commission received and stated the existing building is 22 feet high. He indicated any disturbance on-site will allow the applicant to transplant and re-use the flowering trees currently located on-site. Additionally, the new detail building has a lower pitch and will be an 18-foot low eave. There have been some ideas regarding the

architectural look of the building but they would like to stay with the theme that is currently on-site. The car wash was dropped down to a 10-foot low eave. The estimated usage of the two-bay car wash for private use only is approximately 2,000 cars per month.

A discussion took place regarding the current detailing done by hand and the drive up versus what is intended with the new car wash. Additional questions regarding the new car wash is whether the proposal is for one bay or two, where will the cars go after being washed, will there be a line of cars heading into the wash bays? (Note: Tape recorder malfunction at this point in the meeting dialogue.).

N. Brower asked about on-site vehicular circulation. Drawings indicate vehicles utilizing the site will need to “loop back” toward the main sales building after detailing and if a car wash was needed.

P. Ragucci, stated that he was having difficulty understanding the “perks” associated with the purchase of a vehicle. “How does it work?”

J. Lippmann, requested a written explanation from the owner(s) regarding the usage of the proposed car wash. Ms. Lippmann said she found employee usage of the car wash, acceptable. However, she was not necessarily pleased with car owners using the car wash also. An additional concern was also voiced regarding vehicular turning movements onto Ballston Avenue (NYS Route 50).

K. Semon, requested vendor information regarding the car wash apparatus.

M. Carr, reiterated concern over the potential number of vehicles turning onto and from Ballston Avenue and Freemans Bridge Road. Access to and from Oliver’s Café is another concern. The elevation (height) of the detailing structure is still a concern, even with the attempt to reduce overall height, which is very much appreciated.

E. Esposito, again discussed lowering of proposed building height. Also, commented on the addition of split faced ornamental block along the entire exterior of the detail building.

M. Carr, stated again the fact that the applicant was still proposing a large building in relation to surrounding buildings and his feeling that the proposal was attempting to place too large of a building in a tight spot.

E. Esposito, reexamined the applicant’s design concept and the pre-engineered extension and how the concept is evolving to respond to the commercial building design guidelines within the zoning ordinance. Solutions proposed to mitigate problems include transplanted landscaping, installation of a parapet wall along to roof line of the detail building, and architectural block along the building’s perimeter.

PZC members still feel there needs to be further architectural refinements to meet the intent of the design guidelines. There needs to be further explanation of the number of vehicles utilizing the car-wash and how use will be monitored.

K. Semon, believes that the applicant is headed in the correct direction. However, the car-wash is the significant issue for him.

E. Esposito requested clarification concerning what is need to satisfy use concern over the car-wash?

N. Brower suggested that a written business plan would detail anticipated use of the car-wash.

P. Ragucci agreed with N. Brower.

M. Carr, stressed that any solution must fit the character of the neighborhood.

K. Semon revisited the need for a business plan for the use of the car-wash.

J. Lippmann, thought the proposed size of the building was acceptable. However, she requested more specifics about the type of services being offered within the building. For example, what were the “lift bays” actually being used for? Diagnostics? Detailing versus oil changes or other servicing?

Kirk Austin with Mohawk Honda, interjected stating that the detailing lift bays are to be used for reconditioning of cars. K. Austin went on to add that, presently Mohawk Honda has four (4) detail bays and that last month approximately 1,100 vehicles were delivered.

J. Lippmann, come back to the traffic generation associated with the new proposal, stating that the PZC needs a better understanding of the amount of traffic (numbers) associated with the detailing and car-wash operations.

K. Austin stated that this entire proposal is simply trying to make operations more efficient for Mohawk Honda. He estimated that 75-80% of the vehicles utilizing the car-wah facility would be driven there by Mohawk Honda technicians.

E. Esposito showed PZC members illustrations of existing vegetation, again mentioning that vegetation would be transplanted as screening. Also, the access easement with the owners of Oliver’s Café will be changed to accommodate access to their site and that of Mohawk Honda’s.

MOTION

In the matter of the preliminary Site Plan application by Mohawk Honda to construction of a 10,170 sq. ft. auto detail building and a second 2,880 sq. ft. building to house two (2) drive-thru car wash bays, the PZC hereby tables the application pending written receipt of answers to the following questions:

- 1.) Intent and use of car-wash to include: numbers of vehicles/amount of time? How will monetary transaction be handled? How will car-wash operations be policed?
- 2.) Information about detailing operations.
- 3.) Building’s architectural detail: need to refine further to meet design guidelines.
- 4.) Access easement language acceptable to adjacent owners of Oliver’s Café.
- 5.) Stormwater drainage report.
- 6.) Landscaping plan illustrating buffers, plantings, etc.
- 7.) Pedestrian traffic accommodations in accord with Freemans Bridge Road Complete Streets plan.
- 8.) Hours of facility operations.

Discussion on proposed motion included J. Lippmann reminding Mr. Esposito that the sidewalks along Freemans Bridge Road must extend the entire length of the Mohawk Honda property along Freemans Bridge Road, not just the newly acquired former bank property. Also, reiterate that a “snout” was not an acceptable stormwater management practice for pre-treatment purposes.

MOTION

Moved by: M. Carr

Seconded by: P. Ragucci

Ayes: 6 **Noes:** 0 **Absent:** 1 **Abstention:** 0

Motion Unanimously Approved.

With no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:10 P.M.

Lynn Walkuski
Stenographer

Linda Neals
Town Clerk