



Adirondack Park Agency

PERMIT WRITING FORM – P2026-0048

Assigned EPS: **BJA** Reviewed by: Date: **Click or tap to enter a date.**

APPLICANT

Project Sponsor(s): **Village of Saranac Lake**

Landowner(s): **Village of Saranac Lake**

Authorized Representative: **David MacDougall**

PROJECT SITE

Town/Village: **V. Saranac Lake** County: **Essex**

Road and/or Water Body: **Lake Flower, Lake Flower Ave./NYS 86**

Tax Map #(s): **32.263-1-1.000**

Deed Ref: **269:45**

Land Use Area(s): ☒H ☐MIU ☐LIU ☐RU ☐RM ☐IU

Project Site Size: **1.94±** 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):-

Lawfully Created? ☒Y ☐N

☐ Pre-existing subdivision: -

River Area: ☒Y ☐N If Yes: ☐Wild - ☐Scenic - ☒Recreational Name of River: **Saranac River (Rivers
Regs do not apply in Hamlet)**

CEAs (include all): ☒Wetland - ☐Fed Hwy - ☐State Hwy - ☐State Land - ☐Elevation - ☐Study River

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Construction of a shoreline access structure consisting of a floating curbed dock and, canoe and kayak launch and an access gangway to provide public ADA-compliant paddling access to Lake Flower.

JURISDICTION (including legal citation)

578.3(n)(iii) – Wetland fill/excavation

806 shoreline restrictions – nonconforming structure >100sqft within 50' setback in Hamlet

PRIOR PERMITS / SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS BEING SUPERSEDED

None

FINDINGS OF FACT – ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

LAKES, PONDS, NAVIGABLE RIVERS & STREAMS

Check if none ☐

Water Body Name: **Lake Flower**

Length of Existing Shoreline (feet): **707.4+/-**

MHWM determ.: ☒Y ☐N

Minimum Lot Width: **Not applicable, no principal
building construction, not a
subdivision**

Meets standard: ☐Y ☐N

Structure Setback (APA Act): **50'**

Meets standard: ☐Y ☒N

Structure Setback (River Regs): **Not applicable** Meets standard: ☐Y ☐N

☒Y ☐N Cutting proposed within 6 ft of MHWM? If Yes, < 30% vegetation? ☒Y ☐N

Associated with access path construction to the shoreline access structure .

☒Y ☐N Cutting proposed within 35 ft of MHWM? If Yes, < 30% trees 6" dbh? ☒Y ☐N

Associated with access path to the shoreline access structure. No tree removal within 35'

☒Y ☐N Cutting proposed within 100 ft of river area? (If Yes, include under jurisdiction)

Yes, however Rivers Regs do not apply in Hamlet

Non-Navigable Streams in proximity to development

Check if none ☒

☐Permanent Stream

☐Intermittent Stream

Classified? ☐Y

☐N

[DEC Environmental Resource Mapper](#) stream classification: -

Wetlands

☒Y ☐N Jurisdictional wetland on property, or

☒Y ☐N Wetlands are a basis of development jurisdiction ☒ If Yes, RASS biologist consulted

→ If Y, covertype: **shrub swamp, emergent, deepwater marsh**

→ If Y, value rating: **2**

☒Y ☐N Draining, dredging, excavation of wetland

Area of wetland loss: **"Excavation" through removal of stump within footprint of proposed dock in deepwater marsh wetland** Permanent? ☒Y ☐N

☒Y ☐N Fill/structure in wetlands

Fill/structure area: **Five 3-inch-wide support pipes = 0.25 square feet of total fill in deepwater marsh wetland**

☒Y ☐N Shading of wetland

Area of shading: **380 square feet of shading in deepwater marsh wetland attributed to the portion of the shoreline access structure located within the mean high water mark.**

☐Y ☒N Clearcutting >3 acres of wetland *RASS forester consulted

Clearcut area: -

☐Y ☒N Untreated stormwater discharge into wetland

☐Y ☒N Pollution discharge into wetland

Pollution type: -

☐Y ☒N Pesticide/Herbicide application in wetland

Pollution type: -

☐Y ☒N OSWTS within 100 feet of a wetland

Distance to Wetland: -

Ecological / Wildlife

☐Y ☒N Natural Heritage Sites/listed species or habitat present, including bat

☐Y ☒N Forest management plan existing or proposed ☐ If Yes, RASS forestry analyst consulted

☐Y ☒N Biological Survey required by RASS Biologist 2 or Supervisor ☐ If Yes, completed

Special Districts

☐Y ☒N Agricultural District

Slopes
☐ RASS engineer consulted if structure proposed on >15%, driveway on >12%, or wwts on >8/15%

Existing slope range: 0-8% across entire parcel Building area(s) if authorizing development: 0-1%

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: -

Stormwater
☒ Y ☐ N Greater than 1 acre disturbance, or

☒ Y ☐ N Proposed ground disturbance < 100 feet from wetlands

☒ If Yes, stormwater management reviewed and approved by RASS engineer

Setback to wetlands: 0'

Character of Area
 Nearby (include all): ☒ Residential ☒ Commercial ☐ Industrial ☐ Agricultural ☐ Forested

Adjoining Land Uses / State Land: Hamlet, dense residential and commercial development. Several docks in vicinity, including marina.

 Is nearby development visible from road? ☒ Y ☐ N

→ If Y, name road and describe visible development: Unscreened residential, commercial, and shoreline development visible from NYS 86/Lake Flower Ave and Lake Flower

Additional Existing Development (ex: dam on site, etc.): Existing sports facilities to be removed. Existing monument to be relocated. Existing public short-term dock to remain. Baldwin Park redevelopment depicted on site plan including pavilion not subject to Agency review.
Existing Development**PRINCIPAL BUILDINGS**

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

ACCESSORY STRUCTURES

Structure	Pre-existing (Y/N)?	Lawfully constructed (Y/N)?
Basketball/Tennis courts, to be removed	Unk	Y
Dock	Unk	Unk
Monument	Unk	Y

Proposed Development**PRINCIPAL BUILDINGS**

Structure	Footprint	Height	# Bedrooms	Slopes
None	-	-	-	-

 Check if portions or all below are NJ ☐

 Check if proposed as a non-building lot: ☐

 Have necessary density? ☐ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A - Town has ALLUP and regulates density

 # remaining potential principal buildings = Hamlet = No Limit from ☐ survey or ☐ estimate

ACCESSORY STRUCTURES

Structure	Footprint	Height	# Bedrooms	Slopes
ADA-accessible dock	9.75'x13'	3.2' transfer bench railing	-	0-1%
ADA-accessible kayak launch	5'x20'	~1'	-	0-1%
ADA-accessible gangway	5'x25'	3.75' railing	-	<8.33% per ADA guidelines
Pavilion – not jurisdictional – outside 50' Hamlet shoreline setback.	-	<40'	-	-
Relocated monument	-	-	-	-

ACCESS

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

Driveway is ☒ existing / ☒ proposed	Length: -	Width: -
Sight distance evaluated? ☐ Y ☒ N	Slopes: 0-1%	
Need clearing/grading? ☐ Y ☒ N	Comments: Existing and proposed road-shoulder parking (non-jurisdictional). Deed restricts from property becoming a "parking lot". (Note if HOA or shared maintenance involved)	
Need hwy access permit? ☐ Y ☒ N		
Need easement? ☐ Y ☒ N		
Need signs? ☐ Y ☒ N		

VISUAL / AESTHETIC

☐N/A – no proposed/authorized development

☒Y ☐N Proposed development visible from public areas

If Y, list public viewpoints: Route 86/Lake Flower Ave., Lake Flower

☐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 ☒N/A - no proposed/authorized development

☐Y ☐N Slope suitable for WWTS (i.e., ≤8% shallow, ≤15% conventional)?

☐Y ☐N 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 ☐N 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 ☐N Suitable 100% replacement area identified?

☐ Existing WWTS proposed to remain (needs suitable 100% replacement area)

WATER SUPPLY

☐ Individual on-site ☐ Municipal ☒ N/A – no proposed/authorized development
☐ Y ☐ N All water supplies, on-site and off-site, > 100 feet WWTS? (If No, need DOH waiver)

STORMWATER / EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL **Consult RASS engineer*

☐ N/A – no proposed/authorized development
☐ 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 ☐ If Yes, APA APO / OPRHP consulted
☒ Y ☐ N Structures > 50 years old on or visible from site ☒ If Yes, APA AHPO / **OPRHP** consulted
☐ Y ☒ N Solar Project > 50 acres requiring ZVI & historic inventory ☐ If Yes, APA AHPO consulted
☐ Y ☒ N Within Lake George Park ☐ If Yes, LGPC consulted / application submitted
☐ Y ☒ N Public water supply ☐ If Yes, DEC / DOH application submitted
☐ Y ☒ N Greater than 1,000 gpd wastewater ☐ If Yes, DEC application submitted
☒ Y ☐ N Disturbing bed or bank of classified/navigable water body ☒ If Yes, DEC application submitted
☐ Y ☒ N Disturbing 300 LF or more of a stream (temp + perm) ☐ If Yes, DEC application submitted
☐ Y ☒ N Disturbing ¼ acre of Corps wetlands (temp + perm) ☐ 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

*- Review the Pre-Construction Notification (PCN) thresholds for the [Buffalo District](#) and the [New York District](#) to help determine if an application (PCN) needs to be submitted to the Corps. Additionally, review the [Section 10 waters list](#) to determine if a Section 10 Navigable Waters permit might be required from the Corps.

PERMIT CONDITIONS AND IMPACT ANALYSIS

Merger

Check if N/A ☒

Justification if merger required: **Not applicable, not a subdivision**

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: -

Easement

Easement proposed or required? ☐ Y ☒ N

If Y, consult with Legal for conditions. Justification: -

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: **Attached dock structures – four feet maximum height to most closely conform with dock definition.**

Structure footprint limit and justification: **As depicted and described in Project Plans to minimize impacts to wetlands and variance requested.**

→ 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: -

Guest Cottages (if authorizing a dwelling)

Check if N/A ☒

Proposed and reviewed? ☐Y ☐N

If N, guest cottages potentially allowed? ☐Y ☐N

→ Justification for any conditions: **Not authorizing a dwelling**

Boathouses (if project site contains shoreline)

Check if N/A ☐

Proposed and reviewed? ☐Y ☒N

If N, boathouses potentially allowed? ☒Y ☐N

→ If N, justification: -

→ If Y, review required (beyond definition limits)? ☒Y ☐N

→ If Y, justification: **Prior Agency review required for additional boathouses to avoid impacts to wetlands.**

Docks (if project site contains shoreline)

Check if N/A ☐

Proposed and reviewed? ☒Y ☐N

If N, docks potentially allowed? ☒Y ☐N

→ If N, justification: -

→ If Y, review required (beyond definition limits)? ☒Y ☐N

→ If Y, justification: **Prior Agency review required for additional docks to avoid impacts to wetlands**

Outdoor Lighting (if authorizing development)

Check if N/A ☐

Plan proposed and reviewed? ☐Y ☒N

Building Color (if authorizing development)

Check if N/A ☐

If color condition required, justification: **Not required. Shoreline access structure will not result in undue adverse visual impacts in context of surrounding development.**

Tree Cutting / Vegetation Removal

Town with Northern Long-Eared Bat occurrences? ☐Y ☒N

Indiana Bat habitat indicated on Lookup? ☐Y ☒N

Vegetative cutting restrictions required? ☒Y ☐N

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

- ☐within - feet of limits of clearing
- ☐within - feet of road
- ☐within - feet of river/lake/etc
- ☐within **Within wetlands** feet of wetlands
- ☐Other: -

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 - diameter dbh prohibited
- ☐Other: -

Justification: **A portion of existing delineated wetlands appears to have historically been mowed to maintain as lawn. Cessation of mowing within the wetland, which already appears to be the Village practice, will protect wetland functions.**

Plantings

Plan proposed and reviewed? ☒Y ☐N

If N, plantings required? ☐Y ☒N

→ If Y, species, number, location, and time of year: **Agency reviewed proposed plantings of native species, but plantings are not associated with avoidance or mitigation of impacts of authorized dock.**

Justification: -

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: **No existing principal buildings**

Mathematically available # of new PBs (in addition to existing or replacement): **No density limit in Hamlet**

Extinguishing PBs? ☐Y ☒N If Y, number: -

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

Check if N/A ☒

Municipal system connection approved?

☐Y ☐N

Community system connection approved by RASS?

☐Y ☐N

Proposed on-site system designed by engineer and approved by RASS?

☐Y ☐N

If N, has RASS field-verified location for conventional standard trench system?

☐Y ☐N

If N, has RASS field-verified location for conventional shallow trench system?

☐Y ☐N

Suitable 100% replacement area confirmed for existing / proposed system?

☐Y ☐N

Consult with RASS for additional conditions.

Stormwater Management (if authorizing development)

Check if N/A ☐

Consult with RASS for conditions. Condition required if authorizing development within 100 feet of wetlands or greater than 1 acre disturbance; condition possibly required in other circumstances too. Justification: The Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan shall be implemented to avoid impacts to wetlands and Lake Flower from erosion, sedimentation, and stormwater runoff from new impervious surface.

Erosion and Sediment Control (if authorizing development)

Check if N/A ☐

Consult with RASS for conditions. Condition required if authorizing development within 100 feet of wetlands or greater than 1 acre disturbance; condition possibly required in other circumstances too. Justification: The Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan shall be implemented to avoid impacts to wetlands and Lake Flower from erosion, sedimentation, and stormwater runoff from new impervious surface.

Infrastructure Construction (if authorizing development)

Check if N/A ☒

Construction necessary before lot conveyance: -

Justification: -

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

Explain why no condition is needed: Shoreline access structure will not result in undue adverse visual impacts when viewed from Lake Flower, Lake Flower Ave/NY-86, or adjoining property.

Additional Site / Project-Specific Concerns / Conditions Needed

Washing of equipment for invasive species prevention

Justification:

1. Prevent and minimize the spread of invasive species to new locations in the Park.

Off-site storage of structures when seasonally removed.

Justification:

1. To avoid potential for undue adverse visual impacts from upland storage on project site.

☒Y ☐N **Public comments received** If Yes, #: 1 comment in support. The Village of Saranac Lake Parks and Trails Advisory Board provided a letter in support of the overall Baldwin Park redevelopment proposal, including the ADA-accessible canoe and kayak launch that is the subject of the permit and variance. They cited: Increased shoreline resiliency through and stormwater improvements; enhanced access to Lake Flower, including a new ADA accessible canoe and kayak launch, lake viewing, picnicking and public gathering spaces, with wayfinding and interpretive signage; improved bike and pedestrian access; existing lack of ADA compliant paddling access; the need outweighs impacts to underwater wetlands; and that enhanced recreational opportunities provide stimulus for local economy and community resiliency.

☐Y ☒N **Applicant submitted response (notes, if any) –**

Proposed Stated Benefits:

Provide public Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA)–compliant canoe and kayak paddling access to Lake Flower and the connected chain of lakes, which does not otherwise exist on this body of water.