

Conklin Planning Board Meeting – August 23, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair – (standing in) John Mastronardi, Dawn Shafer, Paul Deeley, Dan Smith

ABSENT: Nick Pappas, Code Officer

ALSO PRESENT: Robert Heary, Attorney – Coughlin & Gerhart
Bill Farley, Town Board Liaison
Mary Plonski, Secretary

VISITORS: Brett Pritchard
Alex Urda

7:00 PM John Mastronardi called the meeting to order.

Agenda Item #1 **Pritchard Property Development Inc.**
10,000 sq. ft. Metal Storage & Office Facility
612,618,628 Conklin Rd.
Tx Map 161.11-1-4.2, 5 & 6

John Mastronardi clarified that he was the town engineer, but because the board was lacking a chairperson, he was asked to step in and help chair the review.

John Mastronardi explained that this meeting was a sketch plan review to discuss what materials and documentation is needed to present a complete application for a metal storage facility. The site is zoned limited industrial. The applicant is Pritchard Property Development.

John asked Alex Urda to give the board a brief summary of what they are looking to do.

Robert Heary, attorney stated that there is a conflict of interest. His firm represents Pritchard Property Development. He can answer any procedural questions but cannot comment on any other aspects of this review. He said the board can discuss if they would like outside counsel for the approval meeting in September.

Alex Urda the engineer for Mr. Pritchard explained that the vacant property used to be a trailer park. Mr. Pritchard is interested in putting his business on the property. He would like to put a steel building up with his offices and storage for equipment. The area is almost 3 acres of space. The property was just surveyed. Because the property is in the floodplain, he is working on the flood study. The intent is to keep filling the site. He is working on the floodplain fill permit. The BFE (base flood elevation) is 853.5. The property now ranges from 847 to 849.5. The building will be up roughly 5' and then tapering out. The building itself will be 2' above BFE at roughly 855.5. The flood model he is using is the current FEMA one. The flood model is the 2007 flood model which is the more conservative one. Most of the property will be paved. They will need to get dump trucks around all four sides. There will be overhead doors on all sides. They want to be able to get around the site with a 50' trailer if they needed to. Parking count is one for every 500 sq. ft. 10,000 sq. ft. building needing 20 stalls. They are planning on 2 entrances. There are currently 4 curb cuts out there. We are going to eliminate 2 of them and use the other 2. There are sanitary manholes from the trailer park. There is one out front that we are going to eliminate. They are planning on tying in on the west side. There are a string of catch basins in the front that they will have to maintain and regrade around them. One will have to be elevated slightly. The intent is to slope the paving towards the catch basins. Water and sewer are there. Sewer and water lines are in front. They are not on the latest drawings. Gas and electric will be hooked up to what is out there.

John Mastronardi asked if the water main is on the same side of the road. Alex showed him the newest map showing where they would tie into the water and sewer. The drawings show the manhole cover.

Paul Deeley asked if it was going to be a sprinklered building. Alex said no, it was not. Alex said it was an all steel building.

Paul Deeley asked what was showing in the corner of one of the maps. Alex explained that the neighbor had been storing items in that area. It has since been removed. Paul asked if it was wet land. Alex said it was not.

Alex commented that the infiltration testing ran 31" in an hour, which is very good.

John Mastronardi asked if he thought he would have any issues with the flood study. Alex said he didn't think so but would know more when it was completed.

Dan Smith asked if he was aware there was a part of the neighbors building on his property. Mr. Pritchard said he was and that it was being removed because the storm had blown the cover off and now all that was there was the poles.

Alex said he would be working on the 239 review and the SWPPP. John Mastronardi commented that the county would also probably request a copy of the Hydraulic Analysis. Alex said he was working on them.

John Mastronardi suggested that we have a complete application with everything in it before we send it with the 239 to the county. Their clock won't start until they have a complete application.

Chris Ostrowsky asked if there would be a dumpster on site. He asked that the plans show the dumpster and the utilities. Egress labeled. He believes there should be the location of any landscaping. Chris also asked about lighting. Mr. Pritchard said he does plan on lighting the building for security.

John M. asked about any signs. There will only be a sign on the building.

Dan Smith asked if there would be maintenance on their trucks performed inside the building. Brett Pritchard responded that there would not be maintenance. The building is used to store equipment. Dan also asked about oil or hazardous waste being stored on the premises. Brett P. said there would not.

John M. asked about floor drains. Alex Urda said they would get tied into the sanitary.

John Mastronardi stated that a short EAF was submitted but asked the attorney if a long EAF might be requested. Attorney Robert Heary said the board could request a long EAF if they wanted. The board was fine with a short EAF.

John mentioned that there was a spill site a few properties down from these properties. The old NASCO building. He also found in reviewing the short EAF that number "13 b" was left blank. Alex said it was a "no". Alex will revise and submit a completed one.

John asked if the 100 year storms stay on site in those retention areas. Alex said it would.

Chris Ostrowsky asked if this would need to have a public hearing. Robert Heary stated there were no public hearing requirements but the board could still request one if they wanted to.

Paul Deeley commented that the plans show the building being raised about 7 ft. with the parking lot also being raised. He asked where the fill was coming from. Brett Pritchard said there was a project in Binghamton that he has been working on removing fill. He has been stock piling at another site and will be bringing it here once all the approvals are in place. He will also use the dirt from the retention sites and redistribute on the property.

Paul Deeley asked if he understood it correctly that the two retention ponds being suggested on site will hold any water coming off the site. John explained that there needs to be 3 storm events analyzed the 1, 10 and 100 yr. The 1 and 10 yr. storms infiltration into the Bio retention areas and the 100yr. had only a small amount of spill over. What he is saying is that with the retention ponds there will be less spillover than before the construction started. The DOT and the DEC have to see less water getting to the catch basins in the front than what is out there today. As it is now the property drains to the back east to west.

Chris Ostrowsky asked if they were bringing the building up to the 100 year flood. Alex said the building needed to be 2 feet above it.

Dan Smith asked what the building elevation would be. Alex stated 855.5.

Paul reviewed the EAF #18, 19 and 20. He asked if the remediation at 650 Conklin Rd. (NASCO) has any impact on this project. Alex said it did not.

Paul Deeley asked the other board members if this was a permitted use in the Limited Industrial zone. Dan Smith along with Chris Ostrowsky stated they felt it was a permitted use.

Chris Ostrowsky questioned if we should have a public hearing. Dan Smith felt it was a good idea. It gives the neighbors a chance to hear the plans and ask questions. It was decided that there should be a public hearing. It will be posted on the website, advertised in the country courier and sent to adjoining properties.

The board suggested the following items be presented before the application is sent to the county for review.

- 1) Revised drawings showing dumpster, gas lines, etc.
- 2) SWPPP.
- 3) Flood Study prepared.
- 4) Updated EAF.
- 5) Building Plans.

It was suggested we meet a week later in September. That gives the county the 30 days required for their review.

Attorney Robert Heary asked if the board would like to have council at the next meeting. All board members agreed it was needed.

Paul Deeley motioned to adjourn meeting **Dawn Shafer second**. All present board members approved. Meeting Closed 7:48 p.m.

Next Planning Board Meeting is scheduled for Monday, September 27th at 7:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,
Mary Plonski