

**VILLAGE OF SOUTH GLENS FALLS
PLANNING BOARD**
DRAFT PRESENTATION OF Meeting and Public Hearings Minutes
 For
 Wednesday **June 14th**, 2017

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

David Linehan, Chairman
 Debbie Fitzgibbon
 Brigid Martin
 Thomas Wade Jr. [TJ]

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Bill Hayes, Trustee
 Nick Bodkin, Trustee
 Joe Patricke, Code Enforcement
 Tim Freitag, Bohler Engineering
 Robert Osterhoudt, Bohler Engineering
 Marcus Andrews, Stewart's Shops
 Ethan Hall of Rucinski Hall Architecture
 Garry Robinson, Consulting Engineer
 Gerald Fitzgerald, Village Resident
 Reed Antis, Town Resident
 Jim Sullivan
 Lisa Tracey
 Michael Muller, Village Attorney

MEMBERS ABSENT or Recused

Gayle Osborn

ALTERNATE in attendance and /or Activated

No Alternates Named at this time

- I. The MEETING was CALLED TO ORDER by Chairman Linehan at 7:00 P.M.** The chair recognized board members present colluding new member Bridged Martin invited all to sign an attendance sheet and presented written agenda.
- II.** The Chair asked for a final review and approval of (**May 10th, 2017**) meeting minutes. **T.J. Wade moved** to approve **May 10th, 2017 Debbie Fitzgibbon** seconded and approval of the **minutes passed with Brigid Martin obtaining.**
- III. SITE PLAN (S) REVIEW (S) [pursuant to – code Ch. 119 OR SUBDIVISION REVIEW [pursuant to – code Ch. 153-41] & OTHER REVIEWS IN PROGRESS:**

Matters regarding the comprehensive plan:	SEE: OLD BUSINESS
Matters regarding capital improvements to: <u>Commercial Use Property</u> <u>Dwelling, Multiple Family /Residential Use Property</u> Industrial Use Property	O'Reilly Automotive Stores, Inc. 110 Saratoga Avenue <i>Schedule Public Hearing for May</i> Stewart's Redevelopment 3 Saratoga Avenue SRSRG T RENTALS, LLC 64 Harrison Avenue
Matters regarding subdivision of land:	
Matters regarding zoning of land:	
Matters regarding other reviews or actions:	By-law update continued into 2017??? <u>Comprehensive Plan to update village challenges</u> <u>WORKSHOP WITH VILLAGE</u>

May, 2017
minutes
approved

	<u>BOARD AND OTHERS INTERESTED OR INVOLVED?</u>
--	---

IV. APPLICATIONS and /or Pre-Submissions FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION(S) FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW [pursuant to – Chapter 119] or SUBDIVISION REVIEW [pursuant to 153-41 Village Code.] &/or OTHER Reviews: (Application(s) reviewed by Zoning Administrator and payments received by Clerk /Treas. on or before application SUBMITTAL DEADLINES FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 2017).

Matters regarding the comprehensive plan:	SEE: OLD BUSINESS / Matters regarding other reviews
Matters regarding capital improvements to: <u>Commercial Use Property</u> <u>Dwelling, Multiple Family /Residential Use Property</u> Industrial Use Property	
Matters regarding subdivision of land:	
Matters regarding zoning of land:	
Matters regarding other reviews or actions:	

The chair turned to agenda of Site Plans and invited SRSRG T RENTALS, LLC representative Ethan Hall of Rucinski Hall Architecture to summarize plans at 64 Harrison Avenue having been presented on several earlier occasions.

Ethan Hall, for the record and clarification that the original project was the apartments and four mini storage units. The previous owner came before the village to remove the mini-storage units, and add some more, town houses and ‘condominiumize’ everything. Once they looked at the cost of ‘condominiumizing’ everything after receiving approval, sold the properties to my client. My client went back to the village zoning board of appeals to clarify that the use for 2 additional apartments planned would be townhouses, not condominiums.

Mr. Hall, referring to plans on easel for public view – reviewed the existing site plan -as is many storage units are gone only concrete slabs remaining. The second proposed site-plan showed the two buildings that includes a total of 10 apartments. This proposed plan - different from the original plan approved of buildings – are all set parallel to the E. boundary line which allows to create more green space and to manage drainage in front of the buildings. The new owners like this design so much that they are considering adding landscaping to the existing buildings. The remaining sheets of plan package submitted include the grading and drainage plan and utility details. The buildings will be tied it to the municipality’s water and sewer services. Maintenance notes to the drainage structure were added as per Mr. Patricke’s request. There is a net decrease in hard /impervious surfaces so there will be more green space on the site that there is now.

The chair - noting that for this review the planning board had previously declared the planning board as lead agency and classified the project an unlisted action – turned to Part 2 of the Short EAF. **The chair** with board approval checked all ‘**No, or small impact may occur**’ answer boxes for questions 1-11. The chair on behalf of the board explained its ‘Determination of Significance (Part 3) stating:
“After a site plan reviews of SRSRG T Rentals submission of new townhouse apartments at 64

Harrison Ave. - the village of South glens falls planning board has determined that the proposed improvements will not result in any significant environmental impacts. The review(s) follows the Village Zoning Board approval for a change in use from condominiums to apartment's on the parcel. Residential growth within the site's vicinity of the village and town has increased. With the benefits of real property improvements that continue there will be some cumulative traffic impacts along Harrison Avenue, especially at the intersection of Hudson and Harrison at the beginning and ending times of middle school sessions." The box noting the action will NOT result any significant adverse environmental impacts was checked. The chair asked for a formal motion.

Debbie Fitzgibbons moved to approve completion of SRSRG Rental's SEQR's Part 3, **Brigid Martin seconded and the motion passed unanimously.** (See attached)

Debbie Fitzgibbons moved to approve, the site plan submission for SRSRG Rental's additional apartment buildings at 64 Harrison Ave. **Brigid Martin seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

The chair then asked that Marcus Andrews to present a summary of changes to the new Stewart's site plan. **Mr. Andrews stated** that he was seeking site plan approval for Stewart's redevelopment at the existing Stewart's site (3 Saratoga Ave.) - intersection of Saratoga Avenue and Main Street. Two homes are in the process of being purchased on Main Street and 1 on Saratoga Avenue that will be demolished to allow construction for a 3,696 sq. ft. shop. Once the new Stewart's shop complete the old Stewart's shop will be demo-'d along with existing gas canopy. A new gas canopy will be constructed. Existing gas tanks (that are fairly new - double walled fiberglass) will remain in the ground with new piping to be installed.

There will be changes to curbs cuts along Saratoga Avenue and Main Street. Main Street will have two full-access curb cuts and Saratoga Avenue will have a right turn in and right turn out only to avoid issues (traffic volume) that exist today. The "technically" right out only curb cut along Saratoga Avenue closest to the intersection is 18 feet wide and located approximately 38 ft. further south of the intersection. Both will be signed and the angle of the curb cuts will force the designated traffic movements. No one will be able to take a left turn out or in if heading south on Saratoga Avenue due to the alignments. He stated that from what he's heard the situation is a traffic light issue. This proposal will help you alleviate any of the existing congestion. Cars heading S. Along Saratoga Ave. will not be allowed to enter the site. The chair allowed **Mr. Fitzgerald** to disagree with the statement that it was a traffic light problem. Mr. Fitzgerald discussed the DOT construction / striping problem in that northbound lane 'restricted' due to stacking of heavy volumes of traffic. Mr. Fitzgerald also recalled statements made that previous meeting that the DOT was going to help solve or accept the problem. Mr. Andrews reported that Stewart's has been given verbal approval for the curb cuts as shown. Debbie Fitzgibbons agreed that the north exit as designed would be an improvement. The chair stated for the record that the **2002 Village and Town... Corridor Improvement Plan for Route 9** [prepared for the Adirondack - Glens Falls Transportation Council] and prepared by Buckhurst Fish and Jacquemart called for a roundabout that would have taken care of Route 9 North bound and other directional /safety issues. He stated, SGF plans do not seem to get implemented /funded [we seem to be a Capital District, Transportation Committee and Adirondack Transportation Council In-Between] Mr. Fitzgerald and Mr. Andrews didn't think it [Round-a-bout] would fit. (SEE Attached.) Mr. Andrews stated that Stewart's would work with DOT and the village if in the future a roundabout is to be reconsidered and built.

Mr. Wade described a recent left-hand turn from southbound Route 9 lane. Mr. Andrews stated that currently there are no signs but the plan calls for do not enter signs.

Additions to the Apartment Complex at 64 Harrison Ave. approved

Fifth, Main and Route 9 intersection's safety and roundabout discussed

Signage to be added

A storm water report was submitted to the village. Pretty much all runoff will be collected and directed to floatable debris and oil separating catch basins then water directed to dry wells to the North of the property with overflows into the State system.

Garry Robinson stated he does have some comments on the plan and will get back in touch with them. In the absence of Mr. Patricke **the chair asked Mr. Robinson** if it was necessary (discussed - usually) to retain himself pursuant to **Ch.119-6 Costs Charged to Applicant / Developer** [The Planning Board may, on complex ... an amount established by the Planning Board to satisfy the fees ... licensed land surveyor, consultant or attorney designated by the Planning Board to review such application for the Planning Board.]

Mr. Andrews asked if there were major issues with a plan. Garry wanted to know who prepared the plans. Mr. Andrews would supply contact information.

Mr. Wade asked Mr. Andrews to review the lighting plan and stated that they are LED lights that are downcast - shine down and do not spill out like old metal halide lamps. He also reviewed that there will be a fence at the back of the property that will border current residential use and also additional landscaping /trees on the Main Street side.

Mr. Andrews gas delivery times for this shop will be between 11 PM and 5 AM unless unforeseen situations, and arrive on the site (entering from main Street) and exit heading N. consequently due to off peak hours avoiding the stacking issue on Route 9.

Jim Sullivan asked to comment -stating he was a resident one property down from the proposed redevelopment site. He stated that Stewart's always does the right thing it wants to make sure that lighting does remain on site along with debris and noise (truck) buffered from neighboring (currently residential) properties.

The chair turned to the check list [*2016 check list included also referenced here in italics*] SEQRA classification **X Checked** [*SHORT FORM submitted. A response to describe hazardous remediation on the site was requested as per Question 20 of Part I Project Information*] *SEE CHECK LIST Item #20*

#1 √

#2 √

#3 *a stamp survey was provided as per Mr. Patricke's request*

#4 **X** N/A - above flood plain

#5 Mr. Robinson has copy of plan to review including SWPP. Wanted contact information of preparer. *The chair explained that what has happened in the past with snow removal [for this site] is that it gets piled up on the sidewalk and usually not removed on the main side for an extended period of time. Mr. Patricke stated that snow removal [of commercial sites] is a concern /problem. Snow removal [policy] should be a condition of approval.*

#6 a. **X SEE: Preliminary PLAN** Revised plan to scale based on a recent survey has locations of area lots, yards **SEE May 10, 2017 minutes**

#6 b. **X Elevations and photo presented**

#7 **X Mr. Wade was concerned with enforcement of traffic movements** onto the site from the South bound traffic of Rt.9 and making left-hand turns into Stewart's when traffic signs prohibit that movement.

[Additional pavement striping [?] **SEE 2017 Plans S-2** *The chair was suggesting current locations of signage may not be in the view-shed of the driver when heading in a westerly direction off the site at certain times because visibility is limited due to traffic volumes. The chair assumed that non-compliance of signage proposed within the Stewart's side DOT right-of-way would be enforceable by the state, county, or local force officials whereas signage within the property limits would not [possibly in the event of an accident]*

Mr. Girard, speaking as a citizen stated that the enforcement part of the issue is already there-with signs that are currently in place and signs as proposed within the right-of-way. Drivers can get a ticket because it is illegal [accident or not].

Debbie Fitzgibbons suggested if tickets were issued word would get out.

Mr. Patricke suggested consulting with the village attorney about the chair's assumption.

Debbie Fitzgibbons suggested a right turn sign only and that some may not know what a no- left-hand turn means.

Mr. Patricke asked about the possibility of Stewart's placing the sign(s) within Stewart's Corp.'s property limits.

2017 Check list includes 2016 commentary

Mr. Andrews stated – signage within Stewart’s property as suggested would end up in the middle of the drive/parking lot pavement limiting / prohibiting movements of vehicles to the North of the site and right turn only exit onto Rte. 9.

Mr. Andrews stated -to speed the request it would be best to deal with the County DOT specifically Chad Corbett-with whom Stewart’s deals with for traffic issues in Saratoga Co.

Mr. Patricke asked Mr. Andrews who Stewart’s Corp. used as a traffic consultant suggesting a consultant might look at sign placement.

Mr. Andrews answered by stating Creighton Manning.

Mr. Patricke suggested any letter addressing signage on the state highway should come from the Mayor.

Mr. Bodkin suggested [the Mayor] copy Senator Marchone and Assembly woman Carrie Warner.

The chair went on record stating -that over the course of time in his reviews of plans[McDonald’s site plan, Ginsburg property subdivision, and the Village and

Town’s transportation study] he has seen the difficulty - in what has been suggested in the past by a consultant or DOT and approved planning board - be implemented as such. And is asking for the Mayor and Village Board to intercede in the implementation of additional signage for safety reasons.] **DOT has reviewed and**

verbally approved 2017 plans and details. Mr. Patricke feels a traffic consultant review may find a better solution and the planning board should for the record decide whether or not to use. **Debbie Fitzgibbons felt that it was not necessary. Brigid Martin stated no –** “It could be 50 years with no changes” (DOT) we will be in the same boat”... signage to be improved. ? Cost of a traffic consultant and no guarantee of improvement, enforcement of traffic rule important factor. Enforcement may need stepping up. **Mr. Wade suggested enforcement may be needed –due to existing traffic patterns-** as he witnessed the use of the center turning lane is being used as a passing lane of the right travel lane when stacking occurs during times of high traffic volumes heading toward bridge. P.B. consensus was that traffic is not a problem specifically caused by Stewart’s or businesses along the route. **Chair was not in favor of more** traffic studies at this point in time as [recent] consultants haven’t ‘showed up’ / participated in discussions to address traffic accidents along Rte. 9, signage, speed limits [incl. village code and enforcement infractions thereof, since DOT Rte. 9 safety improvements.] Chair hoped for better more courteous drivers. **Attorney Muller asked** if there was to be a formal motion for a discretionary public hearing concerning traffic impacts from Stewart’s. The PB consensus of concerns is with NYS DOT. Bill Hayes spoke of DOT’s conflicting signage before the intersection.

#8 pedestrian bicycle access / outdoor seating may be addressed in revise plans?
[Acknowledges **Rte. 9 bike route.**]

#9 location of outdoor storage proposed

#10 Location of roof drains, snout catch basins to drywells **SOLID FENCE DISCUSSED IN GREATER DETAIL** **Mr. Patricke asked** about its location. It extends entire length of boundary between uses and height was changed to 8 feet (Mr.Patricke stating there was no height limit the commercial district) and to be made solid WOOD to withstand wind for better mitigation of noise.

#11-12 No change / Same

#13 Same

#14 Locations discussed (SEE Elevations) Mr. Andrews reported that the power pole is properly mapped on survey and within the state’s right away

#15 [See village code chapter 115] **freestanding sign to be moved see 2017 plan - Application required? ✓ with Mr. Patricke**

#16 locations discussed

#17 **Question whether hours of operation were to change.** Mr. Andrews stated

he was unaware of any changes

#18 X Designation of the percent of building area shown see sheet S-2

#19 □ General landscaping plan and **planting schedule provided**;
The chair noted current a large old Hackberry of high value. Hackberries are found along Rte. 9. Chairs opinion that Hackberry is better ‘urban’ tree specie than Sugar Maple. Outdoor seating area and patio space planned no *bike rack? See 2016 plans.*

#20 SEQR / lead agency status declared :

#21 X Referral of submittal to county pursuant to GM -239 n (Subdivision) **April 23, 2017.**

#22 X Public hearings not required for village’s site plan reviews but a **HEARING WAS HELD May 10, 2017** for “subdivision – merging of Tax map parcels

#23 **Conditions /referral / modifications? – additional July 12th meeting**

#24 X **Survey, Details, Plans to be sealed.** *Mr. Patrick asked Mr. Andrews to supply an existing survey [current] sealed by the surveyor with no plans. The chair noting current surveys are always good to update Town and County tax mapping pursuant to reasons for town’s re –evaluation. Mr. Andrews reported that GYMO PC is the surveyor from the Watertown area*

With Mr. Patricke present the chair reviewed Ch.119-6 Costs Charged to Applicant / Developer [The Planning Board may, on complex ... an amount established by the Planning Board to satisfy the fees ... licensed land surveyor, consultant or attorney designated by the Planning Board to review such application for the Planning Board.] for the engagement of Garry Robinson to review grading and drainage plans. **Debbie Fitzgibbons moved** to retain Garry Robinson to review DEC MS4 regulated grading and drainage plans pursuant to §119-6 - **Brigid Martin seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

P.B. approved village’s consultant review for stormwater plans

The chair asked Mr. Patricke if we had site plan comments back from the County and /or DOT. After more thinking between Mr. Patricke and the chair – the chair wasn’t sure the county had the most recent SITE plans and referral that followed the May subdivision referral. **The Chair apologized** and would look into status of [GML 239m referral] to the county tomorrow.

Mr. Andrews thanked the board.

Robert Osterhoudt of Bohler Engineering introduced himself and began to revisit the site plan, including updates and discussions located at Beach Road and Route 9. **Mr. Osterhoudt** followed up on the number of items since the May planning board meeting. The first was a review of the traffic study that had been prepared and submitted to Mr. Patricke, the board and the village traffic consultant. He also reported on a review of the site plan with Mr. Patricke and staff to correct matters - technical in nature and minor changes. One more significant change on the plan was to include a decorative fence to the rear of the site at the bend of beach road. The fence will now have stone piers consistent with that which is in front. The storm water pollution prevention plan was revised. Another issue reviewed was the truck circulation. Note changes were made, but **Mr. Osterhoudt** explained that O’Reilly truck drivers are employees trained and familiar with store delivery. He reported that truck deliveries to this site will be after-hours when no cars will be in the parking lot to obstruct truck turn movements (store hours are 7:30 a.m. till 9:00 at night.) The truck turning exhibit is now shown on full-scale drawing.

As far as the traffic study concerns - traffic and trip generation rates found in the study from the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) are very conservative - based on national standards. Three scenarios for the level of service are presented for the access to the site from Rte. 9. #1. A no build scenario considering traffic in two years #2[LOS C]. A build condition [LOS is E] the #3 scenario [LOS is F] was based on conversations with the traffic consultant looking at future development of the site to the North. Information in the third scenario is basically background for the planning board's information on future condition (3,000 sq. ft. bank) and not on impacts specific to O'Reilly – auto parts store use.

The summary of the report concludes – inclusive of pass by trips (70 total) is well under the 100 trips that normally triggers a traffic study [SEE sec. 7.0 of Village /Town 2002 Corridor Study 'Traffic Impact Studies'] [The LOS of the accesses including shared the shared access for the project site is either E's or F's for all weekday or Saturday peak hours] – The LOS based on Volumes and queuing prior to Left/Thru /Right turns [FYI see:

[wikipedia.LOS in North America](#)]

The Atlantic Traffic+Design study states that project is consistent with the 2002 Town and Village Corridor Study. Layout of the project will not prohibit a FUTURE traffic signal that the 2002 corridor study considered for the Rt. 9 / Rt. 32 intersection.

Mr. Osterhoudt in conclusion stated it is great project – great re-fill project bringing new life to this specific site. The barn is to be demolished; It will be a new commercial site to improve property tax base /sales tax revenues with no negative impact on schools in addition to other benefits the existing conditions of the site does not now realize. **Mr. Osterhoudt** then asked for any questions.

Brigid Martin asked about this being the first O'Reilly Auto Parts store in NYS state.

Mr. Osterhoudt updated O'Reilly projects stating that we had been working through this project's plans for months. [Bohler Engineering] for O'Reilly's just had a project approved in Syracuse market the other night. A municipality reviewed full set of plans that were approved in one night. It was an uncoordinated review pursuant to SEQRA.

O'Reilly distribution center that will service area is in western Pennsylvania. Colonie store will be a "hub store" where products will be shipped from to stores like this SGF one.

Mr. Patricke reported that he had just received the GPI (village consultant) report the other day [written report is forthcoming.] [Note to attach to minutes] Mr. Patricke stated that GPI was in general agreement and consistent with **Mr. Osterhoudt** summary. **The chair asked** if the 'Level of Service' (LOS) is negatively impacted by a higher speed of traffic where gaps in traffic along Rt. N would be less than uniform due to cars catching up prior to the 30 mile an hour village speed limit. Mr. Osterhoudt stated there may be a benefit but the LOS is based primarily on traffic counts / volume of traffic. **Currently overall the US-9 & NYS-32 intersection (unsignalized) LOS is A.** Currently Saratoga Avenue and 'Baker Avenue / project driveway' unsignalized intersection is C with O'Reilly only built the LOS will be an E. **Mr. Patricke's comment regarding the GPI report was to make the board aware** that access from parcels along the highway levels of service in area will deteriorate not just because of O'Reilly's. **The chair addressed** recent DOT improvements and additional existing (curb cut installed) for the O'Reilly site – an undeveloped subdivision - versus not having it limited to the proposed shared access cut / point. Suggesting it would have been consistent with County [and traffic planner – See Village /Town 2002 Corridor Study Sec.7.0] to limit it to the one now proposed to be shared so as to limit "intersections" of ingress and egress movements [see p.43; sec 5.4 and p. 54;sec. 7.0 of Village /Town 2002 Corridor Study.] **Mr. Antis suggested** the project parcel's existing curb cut is best for a direct movement from NYS 32 north to the project site.[SEE p.38 and fig. 30 of Village /Town 2002 Corridor Study] **The chair suggested** with the safety improvement of a third turning lane for all (N.E.S.W. Bound) traffic movements and the long held policy of the planning board to promote right hand turns only to find some safety in traffic signals [or roundabouts] should be maintained for safety and not so much for maintenance of speed and

fun of [navigating] recent improvements.

Brigid Martin asked about truck movements from the site onto beach road. **Mr. Osterhoudt stated** that the access drive from the parcel onto beach road was 36 feet wide driveway so that a truck can more easily make the turn. Mr. Patricke asked about matters of beach “road” or “town parcel” not an actual right-of-way. **Mr. Osterhoudt stated O’Reilly’s** is looking for a temporary easement (so as not to delay the project) from the Village to O’Reilly Auto Parts for both access and the project utilities and when beach road becomes a formal road the temporary easement would be extinguished. An easement 10 feet in (noted as a hatch pattern in the South West corner of the project parcel on the plan) is to be granted to the village for THE road to maintain the pavement - cleaning up ownership.

Chairman turned the board’s attention Part 2 of the Environmental Assessment Form (EAF.) Asking the board to follow and amend his answers as needed.

The Chair read into the minutes ALL the questions and answering All by checking the box No or small impact may occur. Concerning #5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway? -The chairman stated a bike/walkway will actually be installed to improve the level of transit.[The overall level of service will remain a [LOS A(-)] for the area and unsignalized intersection of US Rt. 9 and NYS 32]

The Chair read into the minutes an explanation summary for a negative result in any significant impacts:

The chair of the South Glens Falls Planning Board notes that by using the short Environmental Assessment Form for this unlisted action that the board has systematically reviewed environmental concerns that have been discussed throughout this review process. The planning board has determined that an action to approve will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

This determination is based on a site plan with numerous revisions, inclusive of grading and storm water management and pollution prevention plan with details. The project site is within the village's commercial district and the village’s aquifer protection district. The applicant will be meeting the standards set by the DEC and village to best address certain chemicals of environmental concern in ground water.

Additionally, a site photometric plan, and a detailed traffic study, inclusive of tractor-trailer movements onto, within and exiting the site has been prepared. A bike/walkway will be implemented and actually improve the level of bike and pedestrian safety to the Betar By-Way, trails and beach beyond.

In addition, a Phase 1 A Literature Search and Sensitivity Assessment was completed by the Hudson Valley Cultural Resource Consultants, Ltd.

The chair checks the box determining the action will not result in any adverse environmental impacts will sign this day June 14, 2017 with the Village of South Glens Falls Planning Board.

Debbie Fitzgibbons moved the Part 3 Determination of significance as having no significant impacts **Bridgid Martin seconded** and the motion passed unanimously.

The chair moved to approve the site plan(s) for O’Reilly Auto Parts store dated with

Planning board approves a negative determination on EAF

Planning board approves O'Reilly site plan

revisions 6.9.17 **Debbie Fitzgibbon seconded** and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Linehan mentioned the need for the Village address /consider “Complete Streets” legislation and he would provide more information for the village fathers to consider adopting.(See Attached Post-Star Article)

V. OLD BUSINESS

1. Village ASH Tree Survey **FOR EAB (Agrilus planipennis or Agrilus marcopoli) using NYS Heritage Program iMapInvasives** Request for supply of 2 Garmin eTrex Venture HC GPS Receiver units made] Chair to attempt to consider recommendations of (1/7/15) CAPMO PRISM Task Force where local governments are now encouraged to conduct surveys of their Ash trees and alerting landowners to the threat of Emerald Ash Borer. [www.emerald-ash-borer-confirmed in SARATOGA Co 6.16](http://www.emerald-ash-borer-confirmed.in.saratoga.co)

VI. NEW BUSINESS for 2017?

1. **Review an Annual Report / Update Planning Board Bylaws** [set public hearing date?](#) /
2. **UPDATE WEBSITE**
3. **Update 2008 Comprehensive Plan Village describing changes in the village since 2008** [March 2008 DRAFT S.G.F. Comprehensive plan on-line](#)
4. [NYS Citizens Guide to Local Budgets](#)
5. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/South_Glens_Falls,_New_York
6. **Edit- by priority - detailed list - Goals / objectives / Tasks of the Matrix** *[use of Survey Monkey?]*
7. **Amend PLANNING AND ZONING codes.**

VII. CHAIR’s REVIEW OF CORRESPONDANCE / Resources

1. Various E-Mails, Calls
2. [Planning Commissioner’s Journal](#)

All content on PlannersWeb.com is now free membership is no longer required. Check out the hundreds of articles on a wide range of planning topics -- especially aimed at the citizen planner.

Check out Form Based Code Article
<http://plannersweb.com/2014/12/fbc1/>

3. DFL_in receipt of Village Board Meeting Minutes
4. Internet Resources:

[DOS Opinion-explanation on Alternates](#)

[Guide to Planning and Zoning Laws of New York State](#) [p.91-140]

South Glens Falls [Village Code Chapters \[153-35 Amendments authorized](#)

Saratoga County Map-Viewer <http://www.maphost.com/saratoga/>

NYS Local Gov. Handbook [NYS Local Government Handbook](#)

Site Plan Reviews Pursuant to sections 7-718 of the Village Law

Local Gov. and School Accountability [Local Accountability / Gov. & Schools](#)

Governor’s Initiative <http://cutpropertytaxes.ny.gov/>

- ## VIII. REVIEW FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS - ANNOUNCEMENT for next
- PLANNED** Planning Board is scheduled for **Wednesday July 12th, 2017.**
Submittal Deadline is Wednesday June 21st, 2017.

IX. REQUEST OF CHAIR FOR MOTION TO ADJOURN

The chair asked for a motion to adjourn **Debbie Fitzgibbons moved to adjourn the meeting Brigid Martin seconded**, the motion passed unanimously and **the meeting was adjourned at 8:27 P.M.**

David F. Linehan

David F. Linehan, Chairman
For: SGF Village Planning Board

This meeting has been recorded and found on You Tube

Meeting was adjourned at 8:27P.M.

