



PERMIT WRITING FORM – P2021-0066

Assigned EPS: Devan Korn (57) Reviewed by: /s/JMB Date: 6/15/2021

APPLICANT

Project Sponsor(s): Parkview Development
Landowner(s): GREGORY MACE, AMY J. MACE and SARANAC LAKE VOLUNTEER RESCUE SQUAD, INC.
Authorized Representative: North Woods Engineering PLLC, Joseph Garso PE

PROJECT SITE

Town/Village: Village of Saranac Lake, Town of Harrietstown County: Franklin
Road and/or Water Body: Broadway (NYS Route 86) and Depot Street
Tax Map #(s): 446.68-6-11 and 12 and 447.69-1-2
Deed Ref: Book 178 / Page 173, Book 178 / Page 178 and Instrument 2018-4891
Land Use Area(s): H MIU LIU RU RM IU
Project Site Size: 1.1 ± acres
Same as Tax Map #(s) identified above
Only the H MIU LIU RU RM IU portion of the Tax Map #(s) identified above
Other (describe): Tax Map #s 446.68-6-11 and 12, and a portion of Tax Map # 447.69-1-2
Lawfully Created? Y N Pre-existing subdivision: NA
River Area: Y N If Yes: Wild - Scenic - Recreational Name of River: NA
CEAs (include all): Wetland - Fed Hwy - State Hwy - State Land - Elevation - Study River

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Construction of an approximately 3,000-square-foot building, 47 feet in height, containing professional office space and seven residential units; as well as construction of a four-story, 17,102-square-foot multiple family dwelling containing 63 residential units with an overall height of 56 feet. The project includes on-site parking with vehicle and pedestrian access to Broadway and Depot Street. The development will be served by municipal water and sewage infrastructure.

JURISDICTION (including legal citation)

809(2)(a) and 810(1)(a)(4) – Structures in excess of forty feet in height in Hamlet

PRIOR PERMITS / SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS BEING SUPERSEDED

No prior permits or settlements are applicable to the project site.

FINDINGS OF FACT – ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Lakes, Ponds, Navigable Rivers and Streams

Check if none

Water Body Name: NA
Length of Existing Shoreline (feet): NA MHWL determ: Y N
Minimum Lot Width: NA Meets standard: Y N
Structure Setback (APA Act): NA Meets standard: Y N

Structure Setback (River Regs): **NA** Meets standard: Y N
Y N Cutting proposed within 6 ft of MHWM? If Yes, < 30% vegetation? Y N
Y N Cutting proposed within 35 ft of MHWM? If Yes, < 30% trees 6" dbh? Y N
Y N Cutting proposed within 100 ft of river area? (If Yes, include under jurisdiction)

Non-Navigable Streams in proximity to development **Check if none**
Permanent Stream Intermittent Stream Classified? Y N
[DEC Environmental Resource Mapper](#) stream classification: **Click or tap here to enter text.**

Wetlands

Y N Jurisdictional wetland on property
If Y: **NA** RASS biologist consulted
→ Covertypes: **NA**
→ Proposed development involves wetlands Y N
→ If Y, value rating: **NA**

Wildlife

Y N Rare/threatened/endangered species RASS ecologist consulted
Y N R/T/E or other unique species habitat RASS ecologist consulted
Y N Northern Long-Eared Bat occurrences in Town RASS ecologist consulted
Y N Forest management plan existing or proposed If Yes, RASS forestry analyst consulted
Y N Biological Survey required by RASS ecologist If Yes, completed

Ecological / Special Districts

Y N Natural Heritage Sites If Yes, RASS ecologist consulted
Y N Aquifer If Yes, RASS engineer consulted
Y N Agricultural District

Comments: *The project site adjoins the NY Central Railroad Adirondack Division Historic District*

Slopes RASS engineer consulted if structure proposed on >15%, driveway on >12%, or wwts on >8/15%
Existing slope range: **0 – 8%** Building area(s) if authorizing development: **< 8%**

Soils

Y N Deep-hole test pit completed? (Necessary for every building lot) *Check if N/A*
 If Yes, soil data information determined or approved by RASS soil analyst
NRCS Mapped Soil Series or Other Comments: **Adams loamy fine sand / Monadnock fine sandy loam. The site was historically disturbed and includes stabilized fill and existing compacted areas.**

Character of Area

Nearby (include all): Residential Commercial Industrial Agricultural Forested
Adjoining Land Uses / State Land: **In addition to adjoining private land uses, the project site is adjacent to the State-owned historic railroad corridor including the Saranac Lake Passenger Station Historic Site.**
Is nearby development visible from road? Y N
→ If Y, name road and describe visible development: **Development is highly visible from all adjoining roadways and land uses**

Additional Existing Development: A retaining wall exists along a former railroad siding within the boundaries of the project site.

Existing Development

PRINCIPAL BUILDINGS

Structure	-	Pre-existing (Y/N)?	-	Lawfully constructed (Y/N)?
Tire Repair Shop		Yes (c. 1930)		Yes

ACCESSORY STRUCTURES

Structure	-	Pre-existing (Y/N)?	-	Lawfully constructed (Y/N)?
None				

Proposed Development

PRINCIPAL BUILDINGS

Check if portions or all below are NJ

Check if proposed as a non-building lot:

Structure	Footprint	Height	# Bedrooms	Slopes
Multiple Family Dwelling	3,000+/- SF	46.9 Feet	9 (5, 1-Bdrm / 2, 2-Bdrm)	<8%
Multiple Family Dwelling	17,100+/- SF	55.8 Feet	63 (46, 1-Bdrm / 17, 2-Bdrm)	<3%

Have necessary density? Y N

remaining potential principal buildings = NA in Hamlet from survey or estimate

ACCESSORY STRUCTURES

Structure	Footprint	Height	Slopes
Dumpster Enclosure	252 SF (18x14)	< 12 Feet	< 3%
LED Downlights (3)	< 5 SF	15 Feet	0 - < 8%
Directional Traffic and Parking Signs as required			

ACCESS

*Consult RASS engineer for driveway > 12% slope / *consult RASS ecologist for driveway > ¼ mile

Driveway is existing /proposed Length: 380 Feet Width: 14 – 24 Feet

Sight distance evaluated? Y N Slopes: 0 – 11%

Need Clearing/Grading? Y N

Need hwy access permit? Y N

Need easement? Y N

Need signs? Y N

Comments: Sight distance from the Broadway drive is in excess of 410' to the south and in excess of 400' to the north.

PARKING

Parking is existing /proposed Area: 10,000+/- SF Spaces: 33

Comments: Regrading is required to meet required 3% slope or less where the driveway meets NYS Route 86. Driving and parking surfaces are permeable asphalt and 5' concrete sidewalks will be provided for pedestrians. The onsite access infrastructure for vehicles and pedestrians will be owned and maintained by Parkview Development. Additional unrestricted parking is available on Depot Street. The Village of Saranac Lake has no minimum onsite parking requirement.

VISUAL / AESTHETIC

Y N Proposed development visible from public areas (list) **NYS Route 86, Depot Street and NY Central Railroad Historic District.**

Y N Existing topography / vegetation will screen, if retained

Y N Planting plan proposed If Yes, RASS forestry analyst consulted

WASTEWATER TREATMENT (WWTS) *Consult RASS engineer for engineered plans

- Individual on-site Municipal Community
- Y NA Slope suitable for WWTS (i.e., ≤8% shallow, ≤15% conventional)?
- Y NA Soil suitable for WWTS (i.e., depth to SHGW and bedrock)?
- Y N All water bodies or streams > 100 feet WWTS? (If No, needs variance – from Town if ALLUP)
- Y NA If fast perc (1-3 min/in), water > 200 feet WWTS? (If No, amended soils required)
- Y N All jurisdictional wetlands > 100 feet WWTS? (If No, counts as permit jurisdiction)
- Y NA Suitable 100% replacement area identified?
- Existing and proposed to remain (needs suitable 100% replacement area)

WATER SUPPLY

- Individual on-site Municipal
- Y NA All water supplies, on-site and off-site, > 100 feet WWTS? (If No, need DOH waiver)

STORMWATER / EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL *Consult RASS engineer

- Y N Does proposed development maintain existing drainage patterns?
- Y N < 1 acre disturbance proposed (May need E&S Control Plan if water/slope/soil resources at risk)
- Y N > 1 acre disturbance proposed (SWPPP required, which includes E&S Control Plan)

UTILITIES

- Available on site? Y N Overhead Underground
- Available at road? Y N Overhead Underground
- Proposed for site? Y N Overhead Underground

FINDINGS OF FACT – COORDINATED REVIEW

- Y N Archeologically Sensitive Area, according to OPRHP OPRHP consulted
- Y N Structures > 50 years old on or visible from site OPRHP consulted
- Y N Within Lake George Park If Yes, LGPC consulted / application submitted
- Y N Greater than 1 acre disturbance / SWPPP required DEC consulted
- Y N Public water supply DEC / DOH consulted
- Y N Greater than 1,000 gpd wastewater (municipal system) Saranac Lake DPW consulted
- Y N Disturbing bed or bank of water body If Yes, DEC application submitted
- Y N Creating 5 or more lots less than 5 acres each If Yes, DOH application submitted
- Y N Army Corps involvement If Yes, ACOE consulted
- Y N Agency-approved Local Land Use Program If Yes, Town/Village consulted
- Y N Local Land Use Controls If Yes, Town/Village consulted

PERMIT CONDITIONS AND IMPACT ANALYSIS

Merger

Justification if merger required: **NA**

Deed Covenant

Non-building lot being created? Y N

If Yes and lot is not being merged by condition, no PBs? Or no structures at all? Justification: **NA**

Easement

Easement proposed or required? Y N

If Y, consult with Legal for conditions. Justification: **NA**

Construction Location and Size (may be different for each subdivision lot)

Is new development (other than oswts) being authorized without further Agency review? Y N

→ If Y: Structure height limit and justification: **55.8 ft and 46.9 ft; As proposed and reviewed**

Structure footprint limit and justification: **17,500 and 3,000 SF; As proposed reviewed**

→ If N:

→ Acceptable development sites identified for all subdivision lots with PB allocation? Y N

→ Review of future development required? Y N

→ If Y, justification: **NA**

Guest Cottages (if authorizing a dwelling)

Proposed and reviewed? Y N

If N, guest cottages potentially allowed? Y NA

→ Justification for any conditions: **Project site is located within a Hamlet land use area**

Boathouses (if project site contains shoreline)

Proposed and reviewed? Y N

If N, boathouses potentially allowed? Y NA

→ If N, justification: **NA**

→ If Y, review required (beyond definition limits)? Y NA

→ If Y, justification: **NA**

Docks (if project site contains shoreline)

Proposed and reviewed? Y N

If N, docks potentially allowed? Y NA

→ If N, justification: **NA**

→ If Y, review required (beyond definition limits)? Y NA

→ If Y, justification: **NA**

Outdoor Lighting (if authorizing development)

Plan proposed and reviewed? Y N

Building Color (if authorizing development)

If color condition required, justification: *As proposed and reviewed the exterior appearance of the authorized structures will be compatible with the character description and purposes, policies, and objectives of the Hamlet land use area.*

Tree Cutting / Vegetation Removal

Town with Northern Long-Eared Bat occurrences? Y N

If Y, consult with RASS for conditions. Justification: *NA*

Vegetative cutting restrictions required? Y N

If Y, restrictions required (choose all that apply):

within *NA* feet of limits of clearing

within *NA* feet of road

within *NA* feet of river/lake/etc

Other: *NA*

OR on entire site outside limits of clearing

Extent of cutting restriction necessary within the area noted above:

Cutting of all vegetation prohibited

Cutting of trees of *NA* diameter dbh prohibited

Other: *NA*

Justification: *There is no substantial vegetation located on the project site.*

Plantings

Plan proposed and reviewed? Y N

If N, plantings required? Y NA

→ If Y, species, number, location, and time of year: *(4) 7' Sugar Maples, (1) 6' Black Spruce, (36) 3' Arborvitae to be planted in addition to seeding all disturbed areas after final grading. Vegetation that does not survive shall be replaced annually until established in a healthy growing condition.*

Justification: *Stabilize soils after construction and soften the appearance of the authorized development.*

Wetlands

Consult with RASS for conditions. Justification: *NA*

Density (may be different for each subdivision lot)

Located in Town with ALLUP? Y N (If Y, STOP, Town oversees density.)

Authorizing PB on substandard-sized lot created pre-2000 with no permit? Y N

If N and N, list existing PBs, including whether they are pre-existing/year built: *Pre-existing tire service garage on the site constructed in 1930 will be removed. The authorized development will be consistent with the overall intensity guidelines for the Hamlet land use area.*

Mathematically available # of new PBs (in addition to existing or replacement): *NA in Hamlet*

Extinguishing PBs? Y N If Y, number: *NA*

Wastewater (if authorizing construction of a new PB without further review)

- Municipal system connection approved? Y N
- Community system connection approved by RASS? Y NA
- Proposed on-site system designed by engineer and approved by RASS? Y NA
- If N, has RASS field-verified location for conventional standard trench system? Y NA
- If N, has RASS field-verified location for conventional shallow trench system? Y NA
- Suitable 100% replacement area confirmed for existing / proposed system? Y NA
- Consult with RASS for additional conditions.

Stormwater Management (if authorizing development)

Consult with RASS for conditions. Justification: **Treat stormwater runoff from new impervious surfaces.**

Erosion and Sediment Control (if authorizing development)

Consult with RASS for conditions. Justification: **Manage potential for erosion and additional impacts during and after construction.**

Infrastructure Construction (if authorizing development)

Construction necessary before lot conveyance: **NA**
Justification: **NA**

For permits that will not include conditions related to Building Color, Vegetation Removal, or Plantings

Explain why no condition is needed: **The project site was historically cleared and is sparsely vegetated. The site continues to be mostly cleared with very little woody-stemmed vegetation existing on or adjacent to the project site.**

Additional Site / Project-Specific Concerns / Conditions Needed

Signage and Invasive Species Control

Justification: **Minimize the potential for adverse visual impacts from any signs on the project site and minimize the potential for further spread of invasive species.**

- Y N **Public comments received** **If Yes, #: 1**
- Y N **Applicant submitted response (notes, if any)** **One letter of general support for the project was received that advocated against the inclusion of any commercial retail space within the development.**