

Planning AND ZONING COMMISSION
Town of Glenville
18 Glenridge Road
Glenville, NY 12302
March 11, 2024

Present: M. Carr, Chairman, N. Brower Dobiesz, J. Lippmann, J. Martin,
J. McPherson, K. Semon

Also

Attending: A. Tozzi, Dir. of Planning, C. Pierson, Town Attorney (via phone),
L. Walkuski, Stenographer

Absent: P. Ragucci

Meeting called to order at 7:04 PM

Motion to approve the agenda

Moved by: K. Semon

Seconded by: N. Brower Dobiesz

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 - Ragucci

Motion Approved

Motion to approve minutes from the February 12, 2024 meeting.

Moved by: K. Semon

Seconded by: J. McPherson

Ayes: 5 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 - Ragucci

Abstention: 1 - Lippmann

Motion Approved

**Tune Skis
139 Freemans Bridge Road**

**SEQR Determination/ Preliminary
Site Plan Review/Recommendation to
ZBA for Area Variances**

Conversion of existing one-story building (4,112+/- sq.ft.) motorcycle shop into a ski/snowboard repair/retail sales shop. Modifications to facade to include new windows, doors, signage, and building mounted lights. Existing utilities to remain, existing asphalt parking area to be replaced and re-stripped with additional employee parking area to be added to the rear of the building. Applicant may need variances for greenspace (3.4%) and lot coverage (33.4%). Parcel is in the Freemans Bridge Corridor District.

L. Palleschi, ABD Engineers, was present.

L. Palleschi gave an overview of the project. The applicant, Dylan Drewes, has the property at 139 Freemans Bridge Road under contract. The existing building is approximately 4,000 sq. ft., facing Freemans Bridge Road, and is dilapidated. Mr. Drewes intends to move his business, Tune Skis, from its current leased location at 272 Saratoga Road. Many improvements are proposed, façade changes and site plan changes. L. Palleschi noted they have been before the commission several times and site plan changes include 7 parking spaces in the front, added greenspace, reduction of the curb-cut on Freemans Bridge, leaving space for the proposed future sidewalks on Freemans Bridge, and a curb-cut in the rear towards Walmart. There are also 6 parking spaces along the back. L. Palleschi said there is an easement along the Walmart property. The attorneys are working on the actual easement documentation as we speak. The existing building has a well and septic system. The proposal is to connect to town water & sewer. Landscaping will be added along the front to provide buffering from the parking area. They are appearing tonight for site plan review and recommended area variances. As it is a small lot with an existing building and parking, it has 20.1% green space where 35% is required. After discussing previous iterations this is the best site plan for a difficult lot. At this time, L. Palleschi showed the commission the architectural plans.

K. Semon asked how amicable Walmart was.

L. Palleschi stated he thinks they are ok with it. When Walmart received their site plan approval, they had a condition on the plat that granted easements to all the properties up & down Freemans Bridge Road allowing access to the parking lot. Being that this is a corner lot, it granted this lot more easements. Due to the northern portion being steep, it does not make sense to make the cross connection to Walmart's driveway. We can redefine and lessen what was previously approved.

K. Semon said this is a vast improvement and is happy that it was discussed at previous meetings.

J. Lippmann asked if L. Palleschi could confirm if these are existing easements.

L. Palleschi said the existing easement states anywhere the property abuts Walmart, has the right to access. An internal lot would only have access in the rear of the lot.

J. Lippmann said there was a discussion about the easement that would house the parking to be enlarged to allow for snow storage. Was that done?

L. Palleschi said it was.

M. Carr asked if the previously approved Walmart plan indicated where those entrance ways or the curb-cuts into the parking lot were located and do you know how long that might take?

L. Palleschi replied his understanding is anywhere along the property line. The attorneys are reviewing the applicant's proposal to see if it is acceptable. Andy Brick is representing the applicant here and there has been some headway back and forth.

M. Carr stated there was some concern at the agenda meeting, if the applicant does not get the proposed easement, what will happen with snow storage.

L. Palleschi said they are going to get the easement.

M. Carr replied the town attorney will want to look at the easement language once it is received.

C. Pierson reiterated that she would need to look at it.

M. Carr asked L. Palleschi to address the area variances and the severity of them.

L. Palleschi said for greenspace they are proposing 20.1% and 35% is required. Due to the Freemans Bridge Road Corridor, they are helping to beautify it by providing greenspace. The greenspace is not necessarily on the property, but it will be in the front of the property which will go hand in hand with the other greenspace that is on the lot. There is not much they can do due to the shape of the lot, the parking, and the curb-cut. With the proposed landscaping out front, they hope that will overcome the variance they are requesting.

M. Carr said the town DPW needs information on the infrastructure for tying into town water and sewer. He then asked what will be done with the existing potable well.

L. Palleschi stated it will be decommissioned per health department requirements. M. Carr said that DEC – CP43 is the document to look up.

L. Palleschi said they received plans from the town on water and sewer. The sewer is in the front of the property and the water is located on the same side.

K. Semon inquired how will they close out the septic.

L. Palleschi responded it will be abandoned in place. The septic tank will be pumped out and filled with sand.

M. Carr asked if the county has a specific procedure for that and are they dealing with anyone at the county.

L. Palleschi said they typically have a procedure and he said he is dealing with Dom DiCarlo.

K. Semon asked, since this was a motorcycle shop, were there any floor drains or drywells associated with it.

L. Palleschi said he was not aware of it, but knows there was a Phase I environmental done on this and he believes it came back clean. M. Carr mentioned there was also a Phase II done and it was acceptable. There were only several minor hits.

J. Martin said he believes the pre-existing condition of the parcel and certainly the benefit to the applicant and the community outweighs the variance being sought. From his standpoint he is strongly in favor of the variances being issued.

MOTION

In the matter of the site plan application by Tune Skis, for the conversion of existing one-story building motorcycle shop into a ski/snowboard repair/retail sales shop located at 139 Freemans Bridge Road, the Planning and Zoning Commission finds that this application will not result in a significant potential adverse environmental impact. Consequently, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby issues a negative declaration.

Motion

Moved by: M. Carr

Seconded by: K. Semon

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 – Ragucci

Motion Approved

MOTION

In the matter of the preliminary site plan review application by Tune Skis for the conversion of existing one-story building motorcycle shop into a ski/snowboard repair/retail sales shop, located at 139 Freemans Bridge Road, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby conditionally approves the application.

Conditions of preliminary approval are as follows:

1. The Planning & Zoning Commission counsel will want to review the easements and associated language with Walmart. As a note, the snow storage is tied into the easement and if for some reason the easement is not obtained, then the applicant will need to produce another option for snow storage.
2. The applicant will need to obtain the area variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
3. The Town DPW will need answers as to where the applicant will be tying in and information on infrastructure, etc.
4. The septic tank must be properly abandoned.
5. The existing potable well needs to be property abandoned.

The Commission hereby schedules a public hearing for 4/8/24 to consider the final site plan review application for this particular project. However, in order for the Commission to schedule a public hearing for 4/8/24, 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: J. McPherson

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 – Ragucci

Motion Approved

MOTION

In the matter of the area variance requested by Tune Skis located at 139 Freemans Bridge Road, the Planning & Zoning Commission recommends to the Zoning Board of Appeals, the variance be granted as the variance is not too severe. The improvements proposed will address the existing eyesore and the PZC feels the variance is warranted in order to clean up the property and have a thriving business on Freemans Bridge Road.

Motion

Moved by: M. Carr

Seconded by: K. Semon

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 – Ragucci

Motion Approved

**Robert & Holly Gramuglia
5 Beverly Court**

**SEQR Determination/ Preliminary
Minor Subdivision Review**

Applicant proposes to subdivide an approx. 36-acre parcel into 3 lots. The larger lot will be the applicant's current home (18 +/- acres), lot #2 will be 4.1 +/- acres and lot #3 will be 13.9 +/- acres. Lots #2 and #3 will be new building lots with public water. The parcel is zoned Suburban Residential.

Luke Richardson, Environmental Design Partnership, was present.

L. Richardson gave a quick review of the proposed subdivision. The approx. 36-acre lot located off Beverly Court is to be subdivided into 3 lots. They have achieved the town's required frontages, and he believes they have accommodated all the town has required.

M. Carr stated there are some questions about the wetlands located on the parcel. He asked L. Richardson to discuss the potential of any permitting from DEC that may be required to cross the wetlands.

L. Richardson replied they may need a permit from DEC and Army Corps to cross the wetlands. There is a culvert located where they are proposing the shared driveway, and that is where they would prefer the applicant to go through, the existing culvert. DEC and Army Corps did not think there would be any problem doing that.

M. Carr asked if there were going to be any changes to the pre-existing culvert. Will they be improving it, scaling it upsize in size, so creatures can get through?

L. Richardson said he would have to get back to us on that.

M. Carr stated you have the correct frontage, but it creates a funky shaped lot.

L. Richardson said one of the engineers spoke with the Town Planner and that is the solution they produced. Unfortunately, along Swaggertown Road they are 12 feet short of getting 120 feet on all three lots, but they can do it with the existing 60 feet on Beverly Court.

M. Carr asked if there are any variances needed for the frontages.

L. Richardson said there are none.

J. Lippmann asked about the existing culvert as a driveway is not there currently.

L. Richardson said he does not know why the culvert was originally installed.

M. Carr asked about the permits again. He inquired if the applicant has already reached out to DEC and Army Corps and are permits required.

L. Richardson said he has reached out to the engineer. The engineer said they will have the permits.

M. Carr said they will need the permits before any type of final approval. He asked about the easement for driveway access. To get to one of the properties there will need to be a crossing of another's property, is that correct? Will that easement be drawn up? Town counsel will need to see that language.

L. Richardson said that is right and the easement language will be provided to the town.

C. Pierson said she will need to review it to make sure it states what it needs to.

J. Martin said in addition to the easement it might be a good idea to get a shared maintenance agreement in place.

L. Richardson stated the easement will be for ingress/egress, maintenance, and utilities, as a water line will be running through it as well.

MOTION

In the matter of the minor subdivision by Robert & Holly Gramuglia, for a three-lot subdivision of 36-acres, located at 5 Beverly Court, the Planning and Zoning Commission finds that this application will not result in a significant potential adverse environmental impact. Consequently, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby issues a negative declaration.

Motion

Moved by: M. Carr

Seconded by: J. McPherson

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 – Ragucci

Motion Approved

MOTION

In the matter of the preliminary minor subdivision application by Robert & Holly Gramuglia for a three - lot subdivision of approximately 36- acres located at 5 Beverly Court, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby conditionally approves the preliminary application.

Conditions of preliminary subdivision approval are as follows:

1. The town is to receive the permits associated with wetland disturbance and crossing from DEC and/or Army Corps of Engineers.
2. The town is to receive the easement language necessary for the driveway access, shared maintenance agreement and shared utilities, etc.

The commission hereby schedules a public hearing for 4/8/24 to consider the final minor subdivision application. However, in order for the Commission to schedule a public hearing for 4/8/24, 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: J. Lippmann

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1- Ragucci

Motion Approved

A. Tozzi stated the town review stated the final review should also include compliance with NYS Fire Prevention code.

M. Carr stated there will be an amendment to the previous motion and another vote taken. The driveway, due to the distance in length off the highway, needs to be able to handle emergency vehicles whether it be fire trucks, fire apparatus or ambulances. The driveway and turning radii need to be large enough and it needs to be built to handle a vehicle of that weight. That is the modification to the previous motion.

MOTION – amended

In the matter of the preliminary minor subdivision application by Robert & Holly Gramuglia for a three - lot subdivision of approximately 36- acres located at 5 Beverly Court, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby conditionally approves the preliminary application.

Conditions of preliminary subdivision approval are as follows:

1. The town is to receive the permits associated with wetland disturbance and crossing from DEC and/or Army Corps of Engineers.
2. The town is to receive the easement language necessary for the driveway access, shared maintenance agreement and shared utilities, etc.
3. The driveway, due to the distance in length off the highway, needs to be able to handle emergency vehicles whether it be fire trucks, fire apparatus or ambulances. The driveway and turning radii need to be large enough to accommodate those vehicles and built to handle the weight of those vehicles.

The commission hereby schedules a public hearing for 4/8/24 to consider the final minor subdivision application. However, in order for the Commission to schedule a public hearing for 4/8/24, 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: J. Lippmann

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 – Ragucci

Motion Approved

**Luco Associates, LLC
27 Airport Road**

**SEQR Determination/Preliminary Site
Review, Recommendation to ZBA for
Conditional Use Permit and Area
Variances**

Application is proposing a new 4,800 sq.ft. office building, a 12,000 sq.ft. warehouse to store commercial roofing materials and a 0.86-acre fenced in the contractor's yard. Parcel improvements will be 34 +/- parking spaces, stormwater management, lighting, landscaping, and other associated infrastructure. Project will be serviced by municipal water and sanitary sewer systems. Conditional Use Permit will be needed for contractor's yard & 6 area variances are requested for building encroachment on 50' side setback, parking encroachment on 25' front yard setback, contractor yard encroachment on 50' front, side and rear setbacks and proposed 3 entrances in the ROW. Parcel is zoned Research / Development / Technology.

Michael Roman, C2 Design, and Michael Dussault, Engineering Ventures, were present.

M. Roman gave a review of the project. The proposed project is to be located on a vacant parcel of land across from C2 Design. The building is a 16,800 sq. ft. office/warehouse; approximately 4,800 sq. ft. is office space, and the remaining 12,000 sq. ft. is a warehouse. They are looking for the PZC to review the site plans and make variance recommendations. The variances are important to the project to maximize the usage of the land.

M. Dussault showed where the 4,800 sq. ft. office would be located near Route 50. To the east of the office is the 12,000 sq. ft. warehouse and from the end of the warehouse to the property line is a rectangular shaped enclosed contractor's yard. The contractor's yard will have an 8' chain link fence with an opaque covering. There will be two sliding gates to access the contractor's yard. The first gate is a 30-foot sliding gate located at the northern portion of the yard while the second gate is an 18-foot sliding gate located at the western portion of the yard. There are 19 paved parking spaces along Airport Road for the offices and visitors and 15 paved parking spaces (although shown as unpaved on this plan, they will be paved) in the contractor's yard for employees.

J. Martin inquired about the split in pavement in the contractor's yard. Is it the whole yard or will only a portion be paved?

M. Dussault said at this time they are only planning to pave the parking spaces, which is required by the town code.

M. Carr asked why they are not paving the whole contractor's yard. A. Tozzi replied it is not required. M. Carr said he knows it is not required, but he has questions about materials stored and everything else that concerns the gravel.

M. Dussault said they are also proposing an 80'x20' carport for outside storage of equipment undercover. There are two stormwater infiltration basins. The first is located to the south of the building and the second is in the triangular piece of the property. Water and sewer are located to the northside of Airport Road. They met with DPW last week and DPW did not see any issues with capacity or connections to the municipal system to serve the property. The property has an existing overhead electrical line that traverses the property from Route 50 all the way across and serves buildings to the east. It is a National Grid power line, and they also require a 20-foot-wide easement for the power line. Additionally, they require that no building or stormwater infrastructure is to be within the easement.

K. Semon asked if they knew what the voltage is.

M. Roman said they had several conversations with National Grid, and he does not recall. At the end it was determined if they extend the one pole higher that was the best recommendation.

M. Dussault stated because of the shape of the lot and the National Grid 20-foot-wide easement, there are several variances they are requesting for the site plan.

- First, is for the building side yard setback occurring at the corner of the proposed office. Required is a 50-foot setback, they are proposing 23+ feet, asking for variance of 26 feet.
- Due to the 20-foot-wide easement, which pushed the building closer to Airport Road, there is not a lot of space between the edge of the pavement and the edge of the parking.
 - Parking front setback. Required is 25 feet, proposed is 6 feet, asking for 19 feet.

- The next three variances are in relation to the contractor's yard. The code requires a 50-foot setback for front, side, and rear. He demonstrated where the 50-foot setback line would be and that would cause the yard to be smaller resulting in problems for storing materials, truck traffic/maneuvering,
 - Front yard required 50 -feet, proposing 3-feet, variance of 47 feet
 - Side yard required 50-feet, proposing 10-feet, variance of 40 feet
 - Rear yard required 50-feet, proposing 7-feet, variance of 43 feet
- The final area variance would be to allow three entrances instead of two for better site circulation.
 - Allowed are two entrances, proposed three entrances, variance of 1 entrance

J. Lippmann stated Airport Road was cut off from Route 50 and the county has put in a hammerhead. It looks like this is eating up that area. Has the applicant confirmed that they have proper fire apparatus turnaround on Airport Road and has it been worked out with the county?

M. Dussault replied not yet, but we do.

M. Carr said the site plan does not show Airport Road has been closed off.

M. Dussault said the updated plans will show that.

K. Semon asked the applicant to address the fencing for the yard.

M. Dussault replied it will be an 8-foot chain link, galvanized fence with an opaque covering on the outside. There will not be any barbed wire.

J. Martin asked what is the nature of the covering i.e.: vinyl slats/netting?

M. Dussault said they are discussing netting/fabric as opposed to vinyl.

J. Martin asked what is the height of the materials that will be stored in the yard.

M. Carr also asked what is being stored in the yard as it plays a role particularly with the gravel yard.

M. Roman said there will be equipment there, some vehicles. A lot of the equipment will be on pallets.

M. Carr asked what is the material?

M. Roman said they are storing roofing company materials i.e., UPM roofing rolls, tapered insulation in bulk-all packaged. Everything there is for a specific project and not to be stored as a lumber yard. It will come in and directly go out to a project site.

M. Carr asked if the materials will be stored outside or undercover.

M. Roman replied some of it will. Items such as wheelbarrows will be stored under cover to keep it out of the weather or during the wintertime.

J. Martin asked if the only structure is the shed style structure shown. Is it likely the storage will be above the height of the fence?

M. Roman replied it is the only structure. He said there may be some situations where you will see some of it, but he believes the majority will be below the 8-foot mark. There will be some situations where the rigid insulation will be stacked but again it is light so there are limitations for stacking them.

M. Carr asked if they will be storing any hazardous materials, petroleum products, or chemicals.

M. Roman said no. There is a 12,000 sq. ft. of warehouse so that is where a lot of materials are going to be held inside. There will be racking in the warehouse and a metal shop there as well, but it has not been laid out yet.

M. Carr asked if there are any floor drains planned for the building and where will they go?

M. Roman said there are interior ones, and they will go connect into the stormwater.

M. Carr said no floor drains because they are out of sight out of mind. He would recommend looking at something other than floor drains in the building. It is very sandy there and if there is any type of spill it will get into the ground and then they would have a release on their hands. He would appreciate them looking at something other than floor drains inside.

M. Roman said if they do have them, and they use a separator would that be sufficient?

M. Carr said after the oil/water separators where will it go, into the sanitary or the storm. Oil/water separators, if they are not maintained properly, cause all types of problems. He would prefer no floor drains and he is speaking for himself not the commission.

J. Lippmann agreed it needs to be code compliant.

M. Roman said in some situations since they will have vehicles in there, they will need them as it will be difficult to mitigate.

M. Carr stated he is not asking them to do something that will mess up their operation, but floor drains are not a good thing. He would like to see what they look like, make sure they are properly constructed, and what type of oil/water separator will be there.

J. Lippmann said to alleviate any concerns the commission would need to know exactly what they are doing in there. If it is just water from vehicles because it rained or got snow on them versus washing vehicles down, you are going to need some DEC permits for that.

M. Roman said it is only for vehicles that will be pulling in for loading materials.

M. Carr replied he has seen this happen. Guys from the field bring their vehicles in and hose it down. They start using brake cleaner or some type of chlorinated solvent where it goes into the drain and then

it goes into the ground. It happens and he sees it every single day. He is not saying it is going to happen here, but that is why he is a skeptic.

M. Carr asked if they need a SWPPP for the project. He asked if the applicant would review the stormwater management system.

M. Dussault said they will need a SWPPP. He showed where the catch basins are located, in low spots, and those connected to low spots in the contractor's yard. The storm line runs along Airport Road and then heads towards the back into the infiltration basin. They also have some off-sight stormwater runoff from Airport Road and a little from Route 50 that flows into an existing low spot in the corner and the basin is there to help with the existing drainage flow. Most of the properties surrounding this property all have infiltration basins with no outlets.

A discussion took place about the basin overflow. It is believed that the water drained back toward Route 50, but they could not determine exactly where. Water depth was also discussed.

M. Carr said he is a bit concerned about the severity of the area variances.

J. Martin asked what is the nature of the gravel make up in the storage area? What will be the profile? What size stone, etc.?

M. Dussault said it would be a sure pack topping for now and it might be paved based on budget.

M. Roman said they would look at that being paved, but at a minimum from the corner of the building all the way across to the third entrance would be blacktop and the remaining would be what Mike talked about.

M. Dussault said they do have a concrete apron at the end of the building to help keep it from tracking into the building.

J. Lippmann asked if they knew what kind of stone they would be using.

M. Dussault replied there would be a separation fabric with 12 inches of gravel subbase and 3 inches of topping on top of that.

M. Carr stated the variances for the setbacks are large. He asked if the contractor's yard really needs to be that big.

M. Roman said it is more about the turning radii for the 18 wheelers.

M. Carr asked if they are going to have tractor trailers coming in and out.

M. Roman replied yes.

J. Lippmann and J. Martin both asked for the turning radii to be shown. J. Martin also stated the applicant should be prepared to be address the feasible alternative question.

A. Tozzi stated a third party designated engineer will be reviewing the site plan and the fire code.

J. Lippmann said that is the thing that concerns her the most.

A discussion took place regarding that it is a county highway, and the county does not have proper fire turning at the end of that road. Another question was the rating of the road.

K. Semon said it would be good to know where the supplies are being stored because that will determine where vehicles can come and go. There are two gates and there is an outdoor cover, so where will the pallets be utilized?

J. Martin agreed there should be a layout plan for the yard to show where materials will be stored to show where the trucks can be maneuvered and most importantly that the fire trucks can get in there.

K. Semon asked if the concrete apron is raised.

M. Dussault replied it is not raised.

M. Carr asked if there will be loading docks.

M. Dussault said it will be at grade and they will drive into the building, no loading docks.

M. Carr reiterated what J. Martin said that the applicant should be ready to show and prove why they are requesting such significant variances.

A discussion took place about the turning radii, the National Grid easement shortening the lot, and the size of the contractor's yard.

M. Dussault said they could do a layout of the materials for the yard.

J. Martin said it is just a suggestion, but it would help make the applicant's case for the variances that they are seeking.

K. Semon asked if the applicant would also provide renderings that show the south and east views as well as your vehicle storage building.

M. Carr asked M. Roman if he was designing the building.

M. Roman said he was and discussed the rendering.

K. Semon asked if the HVAC will be on the roof.

M. Roman said it will be inside the office.

M. Carr asked what they anticipate for tractor trailer visits.

M. Roman said 2-3 a week as it varies with time of year, winter would be less, summertime would be more.

M. Carr asked if they would be coming in through Thomas Corners.

M. Roman said yes, they would or go through the Socha entry.

K. Semon asked if there was a client in mind. He also inquired about waste materials.

M. Roman replied the client is Mid-State.

A discussion took place about dumpsters. M. Roman said they will have a dumpster in the yard, which is something they will show and show how it will impact the vehicles coming in and their turning radii. Most of the waste is done on the job site.

J. Martin suggested the applicant buff up their landscaping plan in consideration of the variances they are requesting. He sees there are 9 2 ½" caliper maple trees along the street maybe something can be done to soften the edge of the contractor's yard since the setback is so shallow.

A. Tozzi said the plans call for Norway Maples but, according to town code, those are an invasive species so they would need to switch to another species.

M. Dussault said they increased the number of tree plantings.

M. Carr said the applicant is going to have to make their case to the ZBA. The applicant will need to obtain those variances before the PZC grants any final approval. He said it is a good use of the property, but you need to look at that.

A. Tozzi said the applicant needs to submit an exterior lighting plan and they need to show Airport Road is closed.

M. Dussault said they have an updated survey which shows that.

MOTION

In the matter of the site plan application by Luco Associates for a proposed new 4,800 sq. ft. office building and 12,000 sq. ft. warehouse to store commercial roofing materials, and a 0.86-acre contractors yard, located at 27 Airport Road, the Planning and Zoning Commission finds that this application will not result in a significant potential adverse environmental impact. Consequently, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby issues a negative declaration.

Motion

Moved by: J. McPherson

Seconded by: J. Lippmann

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 – Ragucci

Motion Approved

MOTION

In the matter of the preliminary site plan review application by Luco Associates, LLC for a proposed new 4,800 sq. ft. office building, a 12,000 sq. ft. warehouse to store commercial roofing materials, and a 0.86-acre contractor's yard, located at 27 Airport Road, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby conditionally approves the application.

Conditions of preliminary approval are as follows:

1. The applicant needs to submit an exterior lighting plan.
2. The commission would like to see enhanced landscaping as a means to buffer the severity of the requested variances.
3. The site plans need to show Airport Road is closed.
4. The applicant is to submit a narrative on truck traffic i.e., how many trips, kind of trucks. In addition, a submission from County Highway that states the road is sufficient to handle the truck traffic.
5. The applicant is to submit a detailed layout of the contractor's yard indicating where the materials are to be stored, the type of materials, the type of equipment, and specifically a listing of any potential chemicals, hazardous substances/materials, or anything that can cause irreparable environmental damage.
6. The applicant is to supply turning radii for tractor trailers or the type of trucks that will be utilizing the site.
7. The applicant needs to make sure that there is an adequate fire apparatus turnaround pursuant to NYS Fire Code at the end of Airport Road.
8. It is requested of the applicant to look at an alternative to the proposed floor drains within the building. If floor drains are needed, then the applicant will need to produce an oil/water separator.
9. The landscaping plan needs to remove Norway Maples as they are an invasive species.

M. Roman said when the county closed the road, they just closed it.

J. Lippman replied there is a makeshift turnaround right now, which will be gone with this development.

M. Roman said that was just done for the plows, it is not compliant.

A discussion took place that county highway is not on their property. It is a county issue, but it is still an issue. Since the applicant will be talking to County Highway about the truck traffic and the highway the applicant may want to ask about a hammerhead there. Just make sure it meets the radius.

M. Carr asked C. Pierson if she had any comments.

C. Pierson replied that the variances the applicant is seeking are very significant and if the Planning

Board is ok with it currently and is willing to make the recommendations to the Zoning Board, so be it, but these are very significant variances and when the applicant goes before the Zoning Board they really need to be prepared to answer a lot of questions. Not only is it one significant variance, but there are several significant variances so keep that in mind.

M. Carr stated for the record Colleen is also the attorney for the Zoning Board of Appeals. He said the more prepared you are the better off you will be.

A. Tozzi stated for the record staff originally thought there were going to be two more variances; one for a non-dust free parking for the contractors parking which the applicant is changing, and the other for not meeting greenspace requirements, but they do.

The Commission hereby schedules a public hearing for 4/8/24 to consider the final site plan review application for this particular project. However, in order for the Commission to schedule a public hearing for 4/8/24, 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: J. Lippmann

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 – Ragucci

Motion Approved

MOTION

In the matter of the conditional use permit application by Luco Associates, LLC located at 27 Airport Road, the Planning & Zoning Commission recommends that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the application with conditions.

The Commission's findings in support of our recommendation are as follows:

1. The establishment/operation of the conditional use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, or general welfare of the community.
2. The conditional use will not compromise the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity, nor will it substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.
3. The conditional use will not hinder the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding properties.
4. The proposal does provide adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, and other necessary facilities to serve the conditional use.
5. The proposal does/ provide adequate measures for ingress and egress to the site, in such a manner as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.

6. The conditional use does, in all other respects, conform to the applicable rules, regulations, and ordinances of the Town, as well as the Town of Glenville Comprehensive Plan.

Conditions of Approval:

1. The applicant needs to submit an exterior lighting plan.
2. The commission would like to see enhanced landscaping as a means to buffer the severity of the requested variances.
3. The site plans need to show Airport Road is closed.
4. The applicant is to submit a narrative on truck traffic i.e., how many trips, kind of trucks. In addition, a submission that County Highway starts the road is sufficient to handle the truck traffic.
5. The applicant is to submit a detailed layout of the contractor's yard indicating where the materials are to be stores, what type of materials, what type of equipment and specifically a listing of any potential chemicals, hazardous substances/materials, anything that can cause irreparable environmental damage.
6. The applicant is to supply turning radii for tractor trailers or the type of trucks that will be utilizing the site.
7. The applicant needs to make sure that there is an adequate fire apparatus turnaround pursuant to NYS Fire Code at the end of Airport Road.
8. It is requested of the applicant to look at an alternative to the proposed floor drains within the building. If floor drains are needed, then the applicant will need to come up with an oil/water separator.
9. The landscaping plan needs to remove Norway Maples as they are an invasive species.

Motion

Moved by: M. Carr

Seconded by: K. Semon

Ayes: 6 - Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 – Ragucci

Motion Approved

MOTION

In the matter of the six area variances that include building side yard setback, parking front setback, contractor's yard front setback, side setback, rear/front setback and the number of entrances/exits, the Planning and Zoning Commission has concerns as to the severity of several of these requested variances (some are up to 90+% of what is allowed). As a result, the Planning & Zoning Commission recommends the Zoning Board of Appeals thoroughly review those variance requests and consider some potential mitigation that could be proposed/presented by the applicant such as additional landscaping, modifications to the site plan, or other amenities to lessen the severity of the variances being sought in order to grant those variances. The Planning & Zoning Commission recommends granting those variances based on the applicant's willingness to mitigate which will be less impactful. The applicant is to demonstrate to the Zoning Board of Appeals the need for these severe variances such as the need for truck turning radii, the accessibility for tractor trailers, etc.

J. Martin said he believes there needs to be a thorough rational presentation of alternatives and why they do not work. An example would be the storage yard and why the applicant cannot utilize vertical space for storage which would result in the reduction of horizontal space and the severity of the variance. Those are the types of items he believes the applicant should be prepared to address. Once a layout is received, how is that adequately being serviced in terms of access particularly with emergency vehicles.

A discussion took place where several members would rather see a larger footprint than go higher. Height could be unstable, safety concerns for access to higher areas along with providing views of the materials.

J. Martin said since they are in a business park there is no detriment to the neighborhood, per se, but it is the feasible alternative question(s) that needs to be considered.

M. Roman said they can demonstrate that and go through those.

M. Carr said the applicant is going to need to defend the severity of the variances and explain them. It will be up to the ZBA to approve the variances. The PZC is recommending, with some apprehension due to the severity, but if the applicant can demonstrate it, it will benefit them.

Motion

Moved by: M. Carr

Seconded by: K. Semon

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 – Ragucci

Motion Approved

**Mark Hindes (Plush Hair Studio)
765 Saratoga Road**

**SEQR Determination/Preliminary Site
Plan Review, Recommendation to ZBA
for Conditional Use Permit**

This application is to add a yoga studio to the current Plush Hair Studio business. Location of the yoga business will be behind the hair salon in the metal building. Hours of operation will be 5am-9am & 7pm-10pm (days were not listed on application). Applicant says no changes to the structure except painting interior walls/ceiling. Employee parking will continue to rear of building, while clients will use the front parking lot. Property is zoned Community Business and requires Indoor Recreational facilities to also acquire a Conditional Use Permit.

Mark Hindes, the applicant, was present.

M. Hindes stated he wants to keep a yoga business within Glenville. Currently, they are currently going to Burnt Hills. The yoga business would teach classes which would be off hours from the hair salon operation. The yoga hours are from 5:00AM – 7:00AM and 7:00PM – 9:00PM. There is adequate parking and facilities. The yoga classes will be held in the rear building, approximately 400 sq. ft. in area.

M. Carr asked what is currently in the building.

M. Hinds said it is currently a storage area. The yoga area will be accessed through the front door of the hair salon. There are glass doors that go from the hair salon into the rear building. The rear building also has a side entrance, garage door, and a main door.

M. Carr asked if the operation of the yoga classes will be opposite to the hair salon business hours. He asked if there will be yoga classes at the same time the hair salon is operating.

M. Hinds said no, yoga classes will not be going on during the hair salon hours.

M. Carr asked the applicant if he needs a conditional use permit. M. Hinds replied it is his understanding that he does.

M. Carr stated the property is zoned Community Business and requires indoor recreational facilities to also acquire a conditional use permit. The applicant will need to obtain the permit from the ZBA.

M. Carr said the commission looked at this and they do not have any concerns.

J. Martin said he is glad to see another business in Glenville.

MOTION

In the matter of the site plan application by Plush Hair Studio, for the addition of a yoga studio to the current Plush Hair Studio business, located at 765 Saratoga Road, the Planning and Zoning Commission finds that this application will not result in a significant potential adverse environmental impact. Consequently, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby issues a negative declaration.

Motion

Moved by: M. Carr

Seconded by: K. Semon

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 – Ragucci

Motion Approved

MOTION

In the matter of the preliminary site plan review application by Mark Hinds aka Plush Hair Studio for the addition of a yoga studio to the current Plush Hair Studio business, located at 765 Saratoga Road, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby conditionally approves the application.

Conditions of preliminary approval are as follows:

1. The applicant will need to secure a Conditional Use Permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals because the parcel is zoned Community Business, and it requires indoor recreational facilities to obtain the permit.

The Commission hereby schedules a public hearing for 4/8/24 to consider the final site plan review application for this particular project. However, in order for the Commission to schedule a public hearing for 4/8/24, 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: J. McPherson

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 – Ragucci

Motion Approved

MOTION

In the matter of the conditional use permit application by Mark Hindes aka Plush Hair Studio for the addition of a yoga studio to the current Plush Hair Studio business at 765 Saratoga Road, the Planning and Zoning Commission recommends that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the application.

The Commission's findings in support of our recommendation are as follows:

1. The establishment/operation of the conditional use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, or general welfare of the community.
2. The conditional use will not compromise the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity, nor will it substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.
3. The conditional use will not hinder the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding properties.
4. The proposal does provide adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, and other necessary facilities to serve the conditional use.
5. The proposal does provide adequate measures for ingress and egress to the site, in such a manner as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
6. The conditional use does, in all other respects, conform to the applicable rules, regulations, and ordinances of the Town, as well as the Town of Glenville Comprehensive Plan.

Motion

Moved by: M. Carr

Seconded by: N. Brower Dobiesz

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 – Ragucci

Motion Approved

**446 Saratoga Road, LLC (Rocket Science)
446 Saratoga Road**

**SEQR Determination, Preliminary Site
Plan Review, Public Hearing, Final
Site Plan Review**

This proposal is for the repurposing of the former East Glenville Firehouse. The existing 8,500 sq. ft. building will be utilized as a general office, educational and seminar use. Project includes addition of a new septic system, new concrete pavement, bike station, new entry, new pavement with new parking delineated with striping. New green areas will be established at front & behind bldg., and around new paved areas. Additional upgrades include new roof, drains, fascia, soffits, siding and paint to exterior walls, signage, lighting, entry vestibule and landscaping. The parcel is zoned General Business.

Tim Wade, Verdant Architectures, Erik Sandblom, SRA Engineers, and Brian Corrigan, the applicant, were present.

M. Carr asked the applicant to give a quick report on why they are appearing again before the PZC after they had already received approval, and importantly why their review tonight will encompass all reviews, preliminary, final, etc. They want to encourage and foster new business in town, and they want to see them open and be successful.

B. Corrigan said there were problems with partners on the project. He said Glenville has been nothing but supportive.

J. Martin asked if they are in a good place now. B. Corrigan said they are.

M. Carr stated when the application was approved last year the uses were more intense, however, this application is of a less intense nature therefore the applicant desired and with concurrence by the PZC that tonight would combine the preliminary and final reviews.

T. Wade said Rocket Science will now take over the entire building where previously a café and dedicated vocational space and office space were listed. Nothing has changed regarding the lot (width, depth). The front setback is the same – the existing non-conforming is 7.3 feet and that is what they are holding to. The side yard setback is slightly less, the closest one is on the southside of the building, - previously proposed was 69.75 ft. – now 69.27 ft., rear yard setback is roughly the same at 274 feet. The original proposal had 3 vestibules, and now they are down to one. In reducing the vestibules, a lot of the sidewalks and impervious coverage on the site have been removed. There is 7,700 sq. ft. of pervious area which is a net increase of 2,000 sq. ft. over the original site plan. Some additional trees were added. Previously he believed they were required to have 29 parking spaces. They are looking at a shared parking matrix because they are still looking to use some space for vocational use. The general office will take up the majority of the use Monday-Friday, 8AM-6PM. They are required to have 24 stalls and they are providing 34 with 2 ADA stalls. The generator and generator pad have been omitted which was needed for the restaurant use.

M. Carr said there was a question previously about electrical consumption for computers. If the power goes out then it goes out, correct? Will there be surge protection?

B. Corrigan said that is correct.

T. Wade said originally there were three VRFs which have now been combined into one unit that will sit behind the building. The shrubbery has been kept in the front.

M. Carr asked if the entire strip in the front of the building will be greenspace. The plantings should be salt resistant as DOT will be plowing salt encrusted snow around there.

T. Wade said that is correct. They will also be getting rid of the existing sign stand because some of the sign stands on DOT land.

E. Sandblom said it would require the applicant to have a lease with DOT to keep the sign.

J. Lippmann inquired if there will be business signage.

B. Corrigan said there will be signage on the building.

T. Wade showed the new elevations and where the signage will be located.

M. Carr asked where does the applicant stand with the septic system and does the septic need to be replaced?

E. Sandblom said it does need to be replaced. Originally it was for a 1,500-gallon system that would also support the café. It has been scaled down to a 750 gallon per day system. They have an approved SPDES permit from DEC. However now that they are scaling down to under 1,000 gallons per day that switches the jurisdiction from the state to the county. He is in communications with Dom DiCarlo. He will be working with the county to get this reapproved. The county needs to personally see the perc tests and test pits. They will not do it before mid to late April. They are working with them within those parameters, but they do not have the new permit in hand but are confident that this is approvable. They are getting rid of a few lines and the grease trap and are sticking with the 2,500-gallon tank because it has already been purchased.

M. Carr said there had been some issues with the fence and the boarding up of the building.

A. Tozzi said it has been taken care of.

K. Semon asked if there will be any change of use for the building next to the cell tower.

B. Corrigan said it is just an empty garage and at some point, will probably come back to bulldoze it and build a new one.

MOTION

In the matter of the site plan application by 446 Saratoga Road LLC aka Rocket Science, for the repurposing of the East Glenville Firehouse to include the addition of a new septic system, concrete pavement, bicycle station, etc. located at 446 Saratoga Road, the Planning and Zoning Commission finds

that this application will not result in a significant potential adverse environmental impact. Consequently, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby issues a negative declaration.

Motion

Moved by: M. Carr

Seconded by: K. Semon

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 – Ragucci

Motion Approved

MOTION

In the matter of the preliminary site plan review application by 446 Saratoga Road LLC aka Rocket Science for the repurposing of the East Glenville Firehouse to include the addition of a new septic system, concrete pavement, bicycle station, etc. located at 446 Saratoga Road, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby conditionally approves the application.

Conditions of preliminary approval are as follows:

1. The applicant will replace the septic system through approval from the county health department.
2. The applicant is to maintain the property by making sure the building is boarded up properly, the fence is upright and looks presentable, and no material blowing on site during the time of maintenance and/or construction before the business is open.

The Commission hereby schedules a public hearing for 3/11/24 to consider the final site plan review application for this particular project. However, in order for the Commission to schedule a public hearing for 3/11/24, 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: K. Semon

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 – Ragucci

Motion Approved

At this time Chairman Carr opened the public hearing.

Jonathan Blanchard, KMB Property Services – the applicant's construction company, wants to get the project done.

With no other comments from the floor, the public hearing was closed.

MOTION

In the matter of the final site plan review application by 446 Saratoga Road LLC aka Rocket Science, for the repurposing of the former East Glenville Firehouse, located at 446 Saratoga Road, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby conditionally approves the application. The Commission's decision is based upon the following findings:

1. The proposed use does conform to other applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, including, but not limited to, landscaping requirements, building design, off-street parking requirements, building setbacks, fence requirements, sign regulations, storm water management and erosion control requirements, etc.
2. The proposed use does exhibit adequate and logical vehicular access and circulation, including intersections, road widths, curbing, and traffic controls.
3. The proposed use does exhibit satisfactory pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation, including separation of pedestrian traffic from automobile traffic, the placement and usefulness of on-site sidewalks and walkways, the accommodation for pedestrians at adjacent street intersections, and overall pedestrian and bicyclist safety and convenience.
4. The proposed use does exhibit adequate and logical location, arrangement, and setting of off-street parking and loading areas.
5. The proposed use does exhibit adequate and logical placement, arrangement, size, and design of buildings, lighting, and signs.
6. The proposed use does provide for the adequate type and arrangement of trees, shrubs, and other landscaping elements, as they relate to visual and noise buffering of adjacent sites and the reduction of visual impacts from the street.
7. The proposed use does demonstrate adequate provisions for the collection and/or disposal of storm water, sanitary waste, and garbage.
8. The proposed use will allow for adequate on-site snow plowing and snow storage.
9. The proposed use does demonstrate adequacy and durability of structures, roadways, utilities, and landscaping in areas with moderate to high susceptibility to flooding, ponding, and/or erosion.
10. The proposed use does retain existing trees and vegetation for aesthetic reasons, and minimize soil erosion and siltation.
11. The proposed use does protect adjacent properties against noise, glare, light pollution, odors, litter, unsightliness, or other objectionable features.

12. The proposed use does provide suitable open space for buffering and/or recreation purposes.

Conditions of Approval:

1. The applicant will replace the septic system through approval from the county health department.
2. The applicant is to maintain the property by making sure the building is boarded up properly, the fence is upright and looks presentable, and no material blowing around on site during the time of maintenance and/or construction before the business is open.

Motion

Moved by: M. Carr

Seconded by: J. McPherson

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 – Ragucci

Motion Approved

**Aviva Events Spaces (River Stone Manor)
1437 Amsterdam Road**

**SEQR Determination
Preliminary Site Plan Review**

This application is for an addition to the existing 10,200 sq. ft banquet facility. Approximately 800 sq. ft. will be demolished and replaced with a 2,800 sq. ft. addition that will house a new entrance vestibule, pre-function gathering area, bar, two offices, coat room and storage for the bar and banquet area. Parcel is zoned Riverfront Recreational/Commercial.

Ed Anker, Phinney Design Group, was present.

E. Anker stated Aviva Events purchased the property from the previous owner. Their plans include updates to the ballroom, and adding a small addition to the front to house pre-function space which will allow for ingress and egress primarily for wedding events. He gave a quick overview of the proposed project. He stated they are not disturbing any additional area on site except for a small sliver of the roadway. A porte cochere (overhang) is being created on the building with two columns that fall within the setback. There will be two phases. Phase 1 is for interior renovations and upgrades to the ballroom space which is basically cosmetic. They are adding a small restroom in the wedding party suite (currently the parlor on the left-hand side) and that will be connected to the forced main system. The pre-function space is designed to house about 250 people (standing only). The ballroom can be used as a wedding venue in case the outdoor venue is not available, allowing to extend the event season. He noted the 100-foot setback for the floodplain. The two columns holding up the overhang are the impacts to the floodplain.

M. Carr asked if there is any particular or special construction required for the footings because they are in the floodplain.

E. Anker said it will be standard sonotube footing. It is acceptable in the floodplain.

J. Lippmann stated the applicant just needs a floodplain work permit.

E. Anker discussed the elevation plans with the commission. The carport is designed to allow for a premiere transportation limo bus to be able to go underneath it. They are pulling some details from historic mansions to incorporate in their design, and will include cement board siding, and river stone.

M. Carr asked when the applicant took ownership and how business has been.

P. Gillan replied they took ownership last August and business has been good. They are focused on getting this done this year and selling services in 2025.

J. Lippmann said it looks great and the upgrading is needed.

J. Martin stated it is a good idea for a receiving area.

E. Anker said they have been working with the previous owner, Skip Skarlata, who has been very helpful.

A. Tozzi said the water and sewer lines need to be on the site plans. He also stated they are not part of the districts but must be part of an agreement with the town. E. Anker said he was not sure about that.

MOTION

In the matter of the site plan application by Aviva Events Spaces aka River Stone Manor, for the addition to the existing 10,200 sq. ft. banquet facility with the removal of about 800 sq. ft. and replaced with a 2,800 sq. ft. addition located at 1437 Amsterdam Road, the Planning and Zoning Commission finds that this application will not result in a significant potential adverse environmental impact. Consequently, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby issues a negative declaration.

Motion

Moved by: M. Carr

Seconded by: J. Lippmann

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 – Ragucci

Motion Approved

MOTION

In the matter of the preliminary site plan application by Aviva Events Spaces aka River Stone Manor, for the addition to the existing 10,200 sq. ft. banquet facility with the removal of about 800 sq. ft. and replaced with a 2,800 sq. ft. addition located at 1437 Amsterdam Road, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby conditionally approves the application.

Conditions of preliminary approval are as follows:

1. The applicant will need a floodplain work permit for the overhang/carport.
2. The applicant will need to have the water and sewer lines added to the site plan, so the town has a record of it.

The Commission hereby schedules a public hearing for 4/8/24 to consider the final site plan review application for this particular project. However, in order for the Commission to schedule a public hearing for 4/8/24, 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: J. McPherson

Ayes: 6 – Carr, Brower Dobiesz, Lippmann, Martin, McPherson, Semon

Noes: 0

Absent: 1 – Ragucci

Motion Approved

**Glenville Cricket (NY Capital Sports, LLC)
4281 Amsterdam Road**

Concept Review

Applicant is proposing the following additions/modifications to the site: Permanent seating for 1,200 spectators at the main cricket field (field #1), three pavilions (20'x50') at each of the existing fields, one storage building (30' x 40') for lawn care equipment, three accessory offices, exterior building mounted lighting, related walkways/hardscape improvements, and any additional stormwater management. The parcel is zoned Riverfront Recreation/Commercial.

Ashok Adikoppula, the applicant, was present.

M. Carr stated they talked last week and discussed the traffic study. He believes this got off to an odd start, through no fault of the applicant, but he thinks he speaks for the commission saying they want to see this happen. It needs to be done methodically and you need to follow the rules. If you say you are going to do something, do something, if you are told not to do something, do not do it. The town is in a position to help the applicant. Some items that were discussed were the desire of the applicant to hold more and larger events, and the traffic study that will be required. Needing a special permit in perpetuity, at some point the applicant needs to be at a place where the town does not need to issue these permits, but if the applicant needs to obtain a permit each time, the town has the ability to withhold it if necessary. However, he also thinks the town should not be policing the applicant. They would like to see a narrative from the engineer regarding the operations plan for the site. Since the entire site is within the floodplain they did discuss potential issues as a result.

J. Lippmann said her concern was having paved ADA compliant parking spaces next to the proposed bleachers to provide ADA accessibility.

A. Adikoppula asked for clarification if there are any environmental issues paving in floodplain.

J. Lippmann responded there is not.

J. Martin said he believes the challenge is trying to quantify how many events there are and how well attended those individual events are, which will dictate the adverse impact here, if there is any. If there are two events a year and they are attended by 150 people that is miniscule, but if they are every week and get 600 people each, that is completely different.

A. Adikoppula said that is why they wanted to go with the permits for the first year or two because it is also a learning experience for them. For this year and 2025, they highly doubt there would be no more than 5 events to the capacity of 500 maybe but not to the capacity of 1,200.

M. Carr said you will still have practices so the site will be utilized every day, correct.

A. Adikoppula replied yes, the original parking will be used by the practices, but anything additional will only be used for the special events.

J. Martin said that is his point. If there are regular events held, and they go on a grass area for parking on a continuous basis, then that will get all torn up, but we do not know yet.

A. Adikoppula said the regular use of the three fields being played, if all occupied, would only be six teams.

A. Adikoppula said they would like to come back in front of the PZC in May because they should have the traffic study done.

M. Carr said that is probably a good idea so the PZC can review the traffic study when completed.

J. Lippmann said the traffic study was to address not only the traffic on Route 5 but also the driveway access which may have an impact on the site plans. It does make sense to wait and see what the study says as site plan modifications may be needed.

A. Tozzi said he thought the applicant indicated last week that there were not going to be any oversized events this year.

A. Adikoppula replied there is nothing he can anticipate at this point.

M. Carr asked if there would be any regional championships.

A. Adikoppula said even with the permits obtained last year, there were only 100-120 people at the event.

M. Carr said the applicant is aware of what the commission is looking for and, for the record again, they want to see this happen, but it started with phases and made it confusing. Everybody wants to see a new sport in town, and they want to make sure it is done properly. If there are any questions, reach out to the town.

Without any further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:57 PM.

Lynn Walkuski, Stenographer

Julie Davenport, Town Clerk

FINAL