



Jean Loewenstein – Co-Chairperson
John Viola – Co-Chairperson
Stephen Grandeau
Dwight Havens
Kyle Kordich
Frank Mazza
William Smith (alt)
Leejun Taylor (alt)

Town of Malta

Planning Board

2540 US Route 9
Malta, NY 12020
Phone: (518) 899-2685
Fax: (518) 899-4719

Jaime L. O'Neill – Building & Planning Coordinator
Floria Huizinga – Senior Planner
Adrian M. Cattell – Planner
David E. Jaeger, Jr. – Planning Technician & Board Secretary
Mark Schachner – Legal Counsel
Leah Everhart – Legal Counsel

Meeting Minutes for November 19, 2024

The Town of Malta Planning Board held its regular meeting on Tuesday, November 19, 2024 at 6:30 p.m. at the Malta Town Hall, with Co-Chairperson, Jean Loewenstein presiding:

Present:

John Viola
Jean Loewenstein
Dwight Havens
William Smith
Kyle Kordich
Stephen Grandeau
Frank Mazza

Absent:

Leejun Taylor

Correspondence: All correspondence is on file.

Chairperson Loewenstein read the following agenda into the minutes:

Project #	Project Name	Project Type
24-17	Taupin, LLC (24 Oak Road)	Lot Line Adjustment
24-16 & 24-16A	2272 Route 9 Senior Apartments Phase II	Site Plan Amendment & Special Use Permit

Chairperson Loewenstein elevated William Smith to full voting member status.

Prior to the beginning of the Taupin, LLC presentation, John Viola recused himself since he is a neighbor of the applicants.

24-17, Taupin, LLC (24 Oak Road), Lot Line Adjustment

Public Hearing

Scott Lansing presented for the applicant and stated for the Board that the property at 24 Oak Road Parcel ID: 218.5-1-8.2 was bisected by 0.682± acres (ac) of Parcel ID: 218.5-1-8.1 (Oak Road). Lansing noted that 24 Oak Road was currently 4.13 ac and the entirety of the Oak Road parcel was 4.33 ac. Lansing stated that the Lot Line Adjustment (LLA) proposal would convey the land from the Oak Road parcel that bisected the 24 Oak Road parcel to 24 Oak Road. Lansing noted that this conveyance would allow 24 Oak Road to be one contiguous area instead of two separate, land hooked areas as they currently existed. The new area of 24 Oak Road would be 4.81 ac and the new area of the paper streets would be 3.65 ac.

Huizinga spoke for Planning and noted that with the LLA, the removal of the Paper Street would make things much easier from the perspective of Building and Planning. Huizinga also noted that the lot consolidation would make placing a single-family home on the lot much easier with the elimination of the paper street that currently bisected the property. Huizinga added for the Board that the property would have access via the front section of Oak Road that was owned by the Saratoga Lake Association HOA. She recommended a map inset be added to the plans to provide the full aspect of what the LLA includes. Huizinga also outlined that she wanted draft deeds and descriptions provided upon finalization and to have the final maps filed with the County Clerk. Huizinga also noted that she felt the project was consistent with the Town wide Supplemental GEIS and Statement of Findings, therefore meriting no further SEQR review.

BOARD DISCUSSION

No comments from the Board were received.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairperson Loewenstein OPENED the Public Hearing at 6:39 PM

No comments from the Public were received.

Chairperson Loewenstein CLOSED the Public Hearing at 6:40 PM

**Resolution #2024 – 23
SEQRA**

MOTION by Stephen Grandeau **SECONDED** by Frank Mazza to resolve that the Malta Planning Board on the 19th day of November, 2024 determines that Project #24-17, Taupin, LLC, Lot Line Adjustment is consistent with the Supplemental Town Wide GEIS and Statement of Findings and therefore no further SEQRA review is required.

VOTE:

Kyle Kordich – YES; Stephen Grandeau – YES; Frank Mazza – YES;
Dwight Havens – YES; William Smith – YES; Jean Loewenstein – YES

Motion CARRIED 6 to 0.

Resolution #2024 – 24

MOTION by Kyle Kordich **SECONDED** by Stephen Grandeau to resolve that the Malta Planning Board on the 19th day of November, 2024 approves Project #24-17, Taupin, LLC, Lot Line Adjustment with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall add a map inset to the plan depicting the area of the paper streets associated with Parcel ID: 218.5-1-8.1 (Oak Road).
2. The 0.682± acres conveyed from Parcel 218.5-1-8.1 (Oak Road) to 24 Oak Road (Parcel 218.5-1-8.2) must be merged.
3. The applicant must provide draft Deeds and Meets and Bounds for planning review and upon finalization, the documents are to be filed with the final Lot Line Adjustment plat with the County Clerk.

VOTE:

Kyle Kordich – YES; Stephen Grandeau – YES; Frank Mazza – YES;
Dwight Havens – YES; William Smith – YES; Jean Loewenstein – YES

Motion CARRIED 6 to 0.

Viola returned after the Taupin, LLC presentation and prior to the 2272 Route 9 presentation.

24-16 & 24-16A, 2272 Route 9 Senior Apartments, Site Plan Amendment & Special Use Permit Public Hearing (SUP)

Scott Lansing presented for the applicant and stated that the project is located at the corner of Route 9 and the Round Lake bypass. Lansing also noted that the project was originally before the Board in 2023 and approved Site Plan and Special Use Permit (SUP) approval for Phase 1 in February 2024. Lansing stated that the project being presented for the Board was for Phase 2 and that since the original approval the zoning for the project site had changed from C-9 and R-1 to C-9 only. Lansing noted that the zoning change allowed for the expansion of the project to include the proposed Phase 2. Lansing noted that the complex would have 88 units in total, but that the applicant wanted to change the Phase 1 building to have 44 units instead of 48, allowing the two buildings to have 44 units equally and to be identical in size and design.

Lansing stated that the initial stages of the project were underway with the demolition of the original structures onsite and site grading. Lansing also stated that the project site was 6.31 ac with some onsite ACOE wetlands towards the center of the site. Lansing noted that the Phase 2 building would have an access via a private drive that would connect to the Northwest corner of the parking lot of Phase 1 to be aligned with the site access, wrap around the onsite wetlands, and terminate at the rear of the property where the Phase 2 building and parking lot was proposed to be located.

Lansing noted that there would be at least 2 parking spaces per unit as per Town code, with 190 spaces proposed (176 required). Lansing added that the project met all code requirements and that the proposed amenities would include an expansion of the trail system that is part of Phase 1 that would loop around the Phase 2 building and allow for a loop around the entire parcel, lights, trees, and a gazebo. Lansing stated that the project would only cover 25.1% of the lot area, well under the maximum of 50%, that the project would manage stormwater onsite with a retention basin to the North of the newly proposed building. The site would be serviced by public water and sewer. Lansing stated that he had received engineering comments and that they would be answered before the next presentation to the Board. A report from Hartgen Archeological Associates states the project site contained no archeologically sensitive areas.

Huizinga spoke for Planning, and stated for the Board that the applicant was before the Board for the proposal of Building #2, which is a 3-story building and asked Lansing to provide renderings for the building. Huizinga also stated that she had comments related to the proposed amenity spaces onsite and requested that it be made more robust with benches along the trail, a more attractive bio-retention area, more gathering areas similar to Building #1, a bike rack. She asked how mail was going to be handled for the property, either at a shared location or distributed to the tenants individually.

Huizinga also noted that she wanted Lansing to change some of the Landscape plantings to native plants. An updated traffic assessment with Phase 2 incorporated should be provided prior to the next submission. She also asked that post construction O&M cost analysis be added to the SWPPP for longer term maintenance and operation. She noted that the applicant would need to update their existing wetland disturbance permit to include the additional 0.05 ac of disturbance. Huizinga added that her comments about the SUP were the same as Phase #1 and noted that the traffic assessment report should be submitted prior to a Board decision on the SUP.

Hull spoke for Engineering and noted that most of his comments were related to touching up a few minor inconsistencies on the site plan, but also noted that he wanted to see an expansion of the ADA parking on-site since the project was being proposed with more parking than required and since it would be a senior living facility. Hull also noted that he wanted to see the updated traffic analysis, fire apparatus access plans, and water and sewer Will Serve letters.

Loewenstein asked Huizinga if the Public Hearing was separate from the Site Plan Amendment.

Huizinga stated that they were separate.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Havens noted that he appreciated the emergency access plan that Lansing provided and asked if the exact route of how fire hoses would be laid out to reach the building from the fire hydrant so the fire department would not potentially run out of hose in the event of a fire. Havens also asked Lansing to explain how fire personnel would access the upper levels of the building and asked if there would be standpipes inside the building.

Lansing noted for Havens that he needed to look into Haven's comments further before he could answer his questions and noted that he could add an additional hydrant to help with fire protection.

Viola asked where the proposed hydrants would be.

Lansing stated that 2 were proposed, one at the Northeast corner of Building #1 and the second along the proposed access road to the Northwest of the proposed gazebo. Lansing stated that a third hydrant would be added in front of the second building.

Grandeau asked if the entrance to the proposed building could fit an ambulance and asked if the elevators could handle a stretcher.

Lansing stated that he needed to look into those matters further.

Mazza asked where would snow be stored.

Lansing noted that snow would be piled to the North and West of the proposed parking lot, but that the details would be provided before the next submission.

Smith asked what kind of buffering would be provided for the neighbors to the North of the property.

Lansing noted that the existing wooded area to the North of the access road for the property would be used as screening to the North and that a buffer of existing vegetation along the remainder of the Northern boundary of the property would be kept as a vegetative buffer.

Smith asked what would be used as a buffer along the access road if the existing vegetation were to be cut down if the neighboring property to the North would be developed since it was technically a 60' wide access for the neighboring property that got larger towards the rear.

Lansing stated that there was no plan to provide vegetation along that area since the access road was planned as being along the Northern boundary of the property and because the existing vegetation off the property was deemed to be appropriate as a buffer during Phase #1 approval.

Lowenstein asked if the ADA parking could be moved closer to the building

Lansing stated that the parking could be moved.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairperson Loewenstein OPENED the Public Hearing at 7:08 PM

Shaun Flynn assistant chief of the RLFD thanked Lansing for his efforts, echoed Haven's and Viola's comments and asked for Knox Box locations and if it could be possible to allow for 360-degree access to Building #2.

Laura Caton of 2241 US Route 9 was concerned about the side-yard setbacks for the property and asked Lansing what they were.

Lansing stated that the minimum side-yard setback is 50' and that the project met the requirement.

No other comments from the Public.

Chairperson Loewenstein left the Public Hearing open until a later date.

Lansing stated that he had no questions but noted that the access to Building #2 met fire code and that there would be a sidewalk going around the building as a form of emergency access even though it wasn't vehicular access in the rear. Lansing also noted that he would be seeking a minimum of a SEQRA determination at the next meeting in December.

Planning Board Business

MOTION by John Viola **SECONDED** by Stephen Grandeau to accept the October 22, 2024 minutes.

VOTE:

Kyle Kordich – YES; Stephen Grandeau – YES; Frank Mazza – ABSTAIN;
Dwight Havens – YES; William Smith – YES; Jean Loewenstein – YES; John Viola – YES

Motion CARRIED 6 YES 1 ABSTENTION.

Meeting Adjournment

Stephen Grandeau **MOTIONED** to adjourn the meeting to the next regular meeting or any other meeting necessary for the conduct of the Planning Board, **SECONDED** by Frank Mazza, motion carried unanimously at 7:14 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,

David E. Jaeger, Jr.
Planning Board Secretary
Planning Technician