

To: Guilderland Planning Board

From: Guilderland Conservation Advisory Council

Date: June 3, 2015

Re.: Spoor, 10 Frenchs Mill Road, Altamont, NY 12009

APPLICATION

Applicant(s): Thomas & Donna Spoor
Road, Altamont, NY 12009

10 Frenchs Mill

Proposed Subdivision: A proposed two lot subdivision of two acres.

Location: Approximately ½ mile west of Town Hall next to the Mill Hollow senior housing development.

Zoning: Local Business.

Site Inspection Summary:

Site Inspection Date: May 23, 2015

Meeting Attendees: (May 18, 2015) Applicant Tom Spoor; GCAC Members David Bosworth, Kevin Connolly, Gordon McClelland, Stuart Reese, Gustavo Santos, Steve Wacksman and John Wemple (Chair).

Inspected by: Applicant Tom Spoor; GCAC Members David Bosworth, Kevin Connolly, Gordon McClelland, Gustavo Santos, Steve Wacksman and John Wemple (Chair).

Conclusions: GCAC does not foresee much, if any, negative environmental impact, if Lot 1 is developed so long as appropriate measures are taken related to storm water management in order to deter any contamination of the pond which is nearby and the Normanskill which is to the west of the property.

Submitted by: _____

John G. Wemple, Jr. - Chair

INSPECTION DETAILS

Applicant(s): Thomas & Donna Spoor

Address: 10 Frenchs Mill Road, Altamont, NY 12009

Background: Applicant, Thomas Spoor, who made the presentation for consideration of subdividing his two acre parcel into two lots said there is no plan now for building on the new lot but indicated there is potential in the future.

The property is next to Mill Hollow. Rear of the property abuts the side parking lot of the Town Senior Center building.

Topography: According to Applicant, the property is pretty flat with a little contour toward the rear. Contour lines on the Concept Plan show elevation of 280 feet AMSL on the front portion of both lots. On the proposed new lot, Lot 1, the elevation decreases to 270 ft. AMSL at its mid section and decreases to 260 ft. AMSL on a small area at the rear. At time of site visit, GCAC noted that the front portion was relatively flat with a marked drop in elevation of about 20 feet at the rear which has heavy vegetation.

Vegetation/Trees: Applicant noted that there are primarily pine trees along the rear border. GCAC noted about three pines along the west side of the new lot (Lot 1). There are also some pines at the front as well as maple along the east side. Rear portion of the new lot has heavy vegetation. Existing residence on Lot 2 is nicely landscaped. A few trees, including two or three which appear to be almost dead, will undoubtedly need to be removed when Lot 1 is developed.

Soil: Applicant was not aware of the types of soil on the property. Through the use of the soil survey map from Web Soil Survey site of the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, it was determined that the front half of Lot 1 has EIB soil and the rear half has ScB with possibly a narrow strip of HuE soil running across the south east boundary. Similarly, Lot 2 also has EIB soil on the front portion. The major portion of the lot including the residence has ScB soil with a narrow slice of HuE at the very rear. Using data from "Soil Survey of Albany County, New York" -1992 – James H. Brown, descriptions of these three soils and some of their limitations is as follows.

EIB – Elmridge fine sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes -This gently sloping soil is very deep and moderately well drained. The substratum extends to a depth of 60 inches or more. The seasonal high water table is at a depth of 1 2/3 to 3 feet perched above the clayey substratum between November and May. Depth to bedrock is more than 60 inches. The main limitation on sites for dwellings with basements is the seasonal high water table. Foundation drains installed above the slowly permeable substratum will lower the seasonal high water table. Protective coatings on basement walls will prevent wet basements. The main limitations of this soil for local roads and streets are low strength and frost-action potential. ScB

- Scio silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes. This gently sloping soil is very deep and moderately well drained. Seasonal high water level is at a depth of 1 ½ to 2 feet from March to May. Depth to bedrock is more than 60 inches. Permeability is moderate in the surface layer and subsoil. The available water capacity is very high, and runoff is medium. Main limitation for dwellings with basements is the seasonal high water table. Installing foundation drains with adequate outlets will lower the water table. Erosion is a hazard during construction. Excavations and cutbacks cave or slough easily. Main limitation for local roads and streets is the frost action potential.

Constructing roads with coarse textured fill material and installing surface and subsurface drainage reduces the frost-action potential. Erosion is a hazard during construction. Cutbacks cave or slough. The main limitation affecting the use of this soil as a site for septic tank absorption fields is the seasonal high water table. Installing drainage around the field and intercepting runoff from the higher areas will reduce wetness.

Page 2 of 2 – Inspection (Continued) – Spoor – Frenchs Mill Rd. - May 2015

HuE – Hudson silt loam, 25 to 45 percent slopes - This steep soil is very deep and moderately well drained. The seasonal high water table is perched above the clayey subsoil at a depth of 1 ½ to 2 feet between November and April. Depth to bedrock is more than 60 inches. Permeability is moderate or moderately slow in the surface and subsurface layers and slow to very slow below. The main limitation on sites for dwellings with basements are the seasonal high water table and the slope. In many places the soil is also susceptible to landslides and slumps. Main limitations for local roads and streets are the frost-action potential, low strength, and the slope. Roads should be planned, where possible, to avoid this soil.

Drainage/Wetlands: According to the Applicant, drainage is toward the rear. GCAC notes that the drainage would appear to be in that direction due to the natural contour of the terrain. It was noted at the time of the GCAC site visit

that there is what appears to be a drainage ditch at the rear of the property leading to the pond located southwest of the residence..

Septic/Wells: Plan is to hookup to Town water and sewer. Applicant noted that the existing residence has septic system and that it appears to perc pretty well.

Visual Impact: Applicant stated he can't imagine any visual impact on the neighbor across the road. The amount of trees and vegetation should act as a natural buffer. GCAC does not envision much visual impact if Lot 1 is developed, due to the amount of trees.

Endangered Species: Applicant states there's a snapping turtle but no Indiana Bats or butterflies on his property. No endangered species noted by GCAC at time of May 23rd site visit.

Historical Considerations: According to Applicant, he believes there are none. None observed by GCAC at time of site visit .

Submitted by: _____

John G. Wemple, Jr. - Chair