

Town of Clifton Park Planning Board
One Town Hall Plaza
Clifton Park, New York 12065
(518) 371-6054 FAX (518)371-1136

PLANNING BOARD

ROCCO FERRARO
Chairman

PAUL PELAGALLI
Attorney

JANIS DEAN
Secretary



MEMBERS

Emad Andarawis
Denise Bagramian
Joel Koval
Andrew Neubauer
Eric Ophardt
Eric Prescott

(*alternate*) Jeffery Jones

Planning Board Meeting
May 31, 2016

Those present at the May 31, 2016 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board: R. Ferraro, Chairman, E. Andarawis, D. Bagramian, J. Koval, A. Neubauer,
E. Ophardt, E. Prescott
J. Jones – Alternate Member

Those absent were: None

Those also present were: J. Scavo, Director of Planning
J. Bianchi, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C.
J. Peller, Counsel
J. Dean, Secretary

Mr. Ferraro, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:00p.m. All in attendance stood for recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Minutes Approval:

Mr. Neubauer moved, seconded by Mr. Andarawis, approval of the minutes of May 10, 2016 as written. Ayes: Ophardt, Andarawis, Neubauer, Ferraro, Jones. Noes: None. Abstained: Bagramian, Prescott, Koval.

Public Hearings:

There were no public hearings scheduled for this evening's meeting.

Old Business:

[2016-024] **Clifton Country Road Expansion** – Parking lot expansion, 9 Clifton Country Road – Preliminary site plan review and possible determination. SBL: 2272.-1-33.2

Mr. Bob Miller, Jr., Mr. Tim Miller, representatives for Windsor Development Group, and Mr. Tom Andress, consultant, presented this project which was reviewed conceptually by the Planning Board at its April 26, 2016 meeting. Minor revisions have been made to the site plan in response to comments issued by the town's professional staff, the town's designated engineer, and Planning Board members at that meeting. Since the applicant is not adding a drive-thru, no Special Use Permit will be required. There are no changes proposed for the building's size or façade. An updated landscaping plan includes additional plantings and "streetscape improvements" have been added to aesthetically enhance the site. Existing identification signage will be removed and replaced with a pylon sign and appropriate landscaping. The two new pole-mounted lighting fixtures to be installed along the northerly edge of the new parking area have been included on the plan. One parking space and the pedestrian crossing in the middle of parking area in the northeasterly portion of the site have been eliminated: there will be fifteen (15) spaces along the northerly property border and three (3) in the northeasterly corner of the site. Mr. Andress explained that the increase in impervious pavement will be compensated for in the redesign of the entire Village Plaza stormwater system which is being developed for the mixed-use expansion to the south that is currently pending before the Planning Board.

Mr. Scavo reported that all comments prepared by Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, Ms. Reed, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention, the ECC, Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C., and the Trails Subcommittee of the Open Space, Trails, and Riverfront Committee for all items on this evening's agenda have been forwarded to Board members for their consideration.

Mr. Scavo reported that Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, offered the following comments regarding this project in a memo dated May 18, 2016. Mr. Myers noted that the project lies within the TC-6 zoning district. The building does not meet the build-to line of 41' as required by the code. The proposed plan does not meet the 80' setback requirements on two (2) fronts. Stormwater considerations for the additional impervious area are not mentioned.

Mr. Scavo reported that the ECC issued no comments after review of the application at its May 24, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Scavo reported that Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician, provided the following comment regarding this application. The applicant should provide a narrative which discusses how stormwater runoff will be handled.

Mr. Scavo read comments prepared by the Planning Department. The site plan must include a detail for the new diagonal parking stalls with a notation to the plan that states, "Striping – 4" White Stripes for Parking Spaces". It appears that the existing Handicapped Parking signage does not meet the current NYS Building Code Requirements. "No Parking Anytime" signs are

not present within the handicapped parking access aisles. The applicant is asked to provide a detail for the handicapped access aisle and parking stalls with current signage requirements. The proposed parking expansion provides the opportunity to have the existing handicapped parking areas meet current building code standards. Mr. Scavo commented that the required striping and updated handicapped signage appears to have been added to the revised site plan presented at this evening's meeting.

Mr. Bianchi explained that M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. issued the following comments after review of the preliminary documents submitted for consideration. As noted in Comment 5 of the April 22, 2016 review letter, there may be a need to discuss further with the Planning Board the degree to which the exterior features of the site need to conform to the TC-6 exterior improvement standards. The current plan does provide some level of improvements; however, the Planning Board shall confirm that it is adequate for a project of this type within the TC-6 zone. As noted in Comment 6 of the April 22, 2016 letter, there may be a need to bring the existing site lighting of the property into conformity with Section 7.6 of the Form Based Code. The current plan provides for two freestanding light fixtures to be installed. It appears that there are building mounted flood lights that illuminate the remaining portions of the parking lot. If so, these fixtures should be removed and replaced with similar ground mounted fixtures so that there is appropriate lumens in the parking lot. As noted in Comment 9 of the April 22, 2016 review letter, there should be consideration of replacement of equivalent quantities and species type currently existing elsewhere on the parcel. This topic was discussed at great length during the Planning Board meeting with a focus on the entry to the overall campus. The updated plan provides for replacement of landscaping in and around the entryway. In developing this, it is suggested the columnar type trees be considered as these tend to limit view obstruction, something that appears to have happen with the species that exist now. As noted in Comment 10 of our April 22, 2016 review letter, it was requested that there be confirmation that adequate stormwater facilities exist for the potential increased runoff from the decrease in greenspace. The response provided indicates that the increased runoff will be managed through new facilities planned with the adjacent development. If this is the case, then careful consideration of phasing of work is required. The redevelopment of this parcel may be prohibited until the proposed stormwater facilities mentioned are completed unless interim measures are available.

Mr. Roy Casper, Chairman of the Trails Subcommittee of the Open Space, Riverfront, and Trails Committee, reported that the Subcommittee offered the following comments regarding this application. The applicant's proposed use of greenspace for additional parking on this site will have negative visual impacts on this important town center intersection due to the loss of a significant portion of the present green space and the large pine trees that accent this site. Alternatively, the additional parking required by the applicant may be provided by use of the existing plaza parking lot to the west of 9 Clifton Country Road. This parking lot is seldom at capacity. The written memo provided emphasized that a "discussion of "shared use" of the large adjacent plaza parking lot with the plaza tenants seems appropriate here." A crosswalk should be provided from the existing plaza parking lot to 9 Clifton Country Road and a parking lot centerwalk would provide safe pedestrian access. Mr. Casper noted that the parking proposal does not conform with Clifton Park Town Center zoning TC-6 – Boulevard. According to the TC-6 zoning regulations, "this boulevard is designed to showcase large lawns, shade trees, planted mediums,

and a multi-use path as a parklike setting, fronted on either side by continuous shopfronts, sidewalks, and outdoor patios.”

Mr. Ophardt reported that, based upon measurements taken at the site this afternoon, there appears to be a discrepancy between the amount of greenspace along the northerly side of the site between the proposed parking area and the existing asphalt walkway. It appears that a greenspace area 20’ in width - rather than the 2’-3’ wide strip shown on the plan - will be preserved. This increased width of greenspace might possibly allow for the preservation of the existing mature trees. Mr. Ferraro observed that such a change of dimension would mean that the existing building was situated approximately 100’ from the minor roadway that serves as the Village Plaza access drive to the north of the parcel. He called for a revised site plan that accurately depicts site conditions. Citing applicable sections of the Town Center Zoning Code that required “connectivity of the building to the streetscape,” he called for preservation to the greatest extent practicable of existing vegetation and preparation of a “quality landscaping plan” that would “compensate for the loss of greenspace” on the site. He did note that it was apparent that some trees were “aging out” and called for their replacement with “more quality landscaping.” Mr. Neubauer recognized the applicant’s effort to effect “incremental change” as called for in the Zoning Code, stating that though future site improvements may eventually bring storefronts to the “build-to” lines, the proposed metal fencing appears to address current concerns. Mr. Andress pointed out that the fencing proposed is intended to provide a cohesive design feature for the build-out proposed for the Village Plaza complex. Mr. Ferraro encouraged the applicant to continue the fencing along the Village Plaza access roadway. Mr. Neubauer agreed that the treatment would “place a conceptual storefront look” along that roadway, though he commented that the proposed parking was contrary to zoning guidelines. Mr. Andarawis stated that the proposed three parking spaces located in the northeasterly corner of the site should be eliminated or “landbanked” if not needed at this time. Mr. Bob Miller stated that the parking spaces are required by the lease agreement currently being negotiated with the prospective tenant, that he did not believe that “green areas really require fencing,” and that there was a need to “keep an eye on the economic viability” of the project. Though Mr. Jones questioned the need for the proposed three spaces, Mr. Miller explained that they are significant for customer convenience and visibility, stating that the applicants are well aware of the “importance of this particular corner” and that it will be visibly enhanced in the “careful attention to detail” style Windsor Development has exhibited in the past. Mr. Koval agreed that there is a need for parking close to the entranceways to businesses. Mr. Ferraro acknowledged the applicant’s efforts “to create an ambiance” and design plan that provides continuity between this project and the adjoining proposed mixed-use project to the south and stated that “he would compromise” on the parking issue if the applicants would provide an accurate and detailed site plan that includes a comprehensive landscaping plan which identifies specific botanical species and provides a sufficient number of quality vegetative materials. Referencing the discussion regarding the convenience of parking for business patrons, Mr. Andarawis noted that future development within the town center zoning district may require that parking be less conveniently located. Mr. Ferraro stated that the “safety of pedestrians” should be of paramount concern in site designs. Summarizing the Board’s discussion, Mr. Neubauer stated that he appreciated the applicant’s economic concerns and that he believes that the site could be designed so to render the disputed parking spaces “insignificant.” The applicant was asked to provide an accurate site plan that included correct setbacks, explore the feasibility of extending the metal fencing along the entranceway to Village Plaza, and prepare a “quality landscaping plan” that

includes both the common and botanical names of the species to be installed, the number of plantings, and the proposed locations for the plantings.

New Business:

[2016-029] **Prestige Motor Car** – Proposed 7,120 SF addition to existing two-story warehouse building, 1926-1928 Route 9 – Conceptual site plan review. SBL: 259.-2-108

Mr. Tom Andress, consultant for the applicant, presented this application which calls for the construction of a 7,120 SF addition to an existing two-story, 9,854 SF warehouse building at 1928 Route 9. The 3.76 acre parcel is located within the LI-2 zoning district on the westerly side of Route 9 just south of the Boston and Maine Railroad line. Mr. Andress explained that the site plan presented reflects a revision to the original site plan which called for the construction of a 4,000 SF addition. As previously proposed, the 4,000 SF addition was to be constructed with basement storage. After review of the flood plain elevations, however, it was determined that the basement would be below the flood plain elevation of 190'. The finished floor elevation as now proposed would be 196.44'. The speaker explained that no other site changes are proposed. He noted that the addition will be situated "mainly within the approved site plan's pavement area," resulting in minimal new disturbance. The building will require additional parking spaces: the spaces will be added to the preliminary site plan. Mr. Andress reported that the existing stormwater basin has been stabilized. In response to Mr. Ferraro's question concerning the adequacy of the stormwater management area to handle additional runoff, Mr. Andress offered a positive response. He explained that original site plan approvals called for substantial improvements to the stormwater management facilities and that drainage from the site is now treated before entering wetlands and the stream significantly improving the water quality of that stream – headwaters of the Dwaas Kill - which has been designated by NYSDEC as an "impaired waterway."

Mr. Scavo reported that Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, provided a number of comments regarding this application. Referencing previous applications for development of this parcel, Mr. Myers described the application as "yet another expansion of the building footprint towards the Dwaas Kill." He questioned the meaning of the note on the plan that states that the "stormwater management area is under construction." Further wetland disturbances are proposed: the last extension of the west building was 50' towards the Dwaas Kill while the current plan places the building 22' closer to the stream corridor. The site plan depicts the 100' LC zone from the "edge of stream" rather than from the "high water elevation." The site plan does not include site work completed behind the west building along the railroad lands. Mr. Myers commented that the plan shows that a stormwater line will be installed under the proposed building extension. The stormwater retention area will require fencing due to its depth. No Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan has been submitted for review. A stamped flood elevation certificate should be required since the lowest floor elevation must be 2' above the indicated flood elevation.

Mr. Scavo reported that the ECC offered the following comments regarding this application. The applicant shall produce an existing conditions survey map of the current stormwater management areas, all gravel/impervious surfaces, and the location of underground rooftop drainage piping. The NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual required elements

for pond buffers shall be provided that extends 25 feet outward from the maximum water surface elevation of the pond. The pond buffer shall be contiguous with other buffer areas that are required by existing regulations (i.e. stream buffers). An additional setback may be provided to permanent structures. The ECC is concerned with the additional grading required in the LC zone for the proposed construction. The ECC recommends that the applicant demonstrate that the land within the LC zone will not be altered for any purpose during construction of the proposed additions per Town Code Section 208-69.2.

Mr. Scavo explained that Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician, offered two comments regarding this application in a memo dated May 20, 2016. The applicant must provide an updated Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for the increased impervious area. The site plan drawing should show all grading limits for the proposed construction.

Mr. Scavo reported that Ms. Reed, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention, provided the following comment regarding this application in a memo dated May 31, 2016. The proposed addition is required to have a fire access road to all portions of the building. The rear of the building would be required to have this access for emergency services and building egress per the Fire Code of New York State. The applicant is asked to clarify how access to the rear of the building will be achieved due to the topographical elevations.

Mr. Scavo read comments prepared by the Planning Department. The applicant should verify that the previously approved Stormwater Management Area has been constructed in accordance with a previous approval and no additional construction activities are occurring as noted on the conceptual site plan. Since the proposal is within 500' of US Route 9 a referral to the Saratoga County Planning Board is required. The applicant is asked to display the additional work completed west of the building on the site plan to provide fire access at the request of the Building Department. The site plan must indicate where the limits of disturbance for clearing and grading will occur. Protective measures to avoid potential impacts to the adjacent wetland and designated LC zone (NYS DEC Wetland Buffer) should be taken. Protection of the wetland has been the major priority for any activities conducted on this site. The wetlands are important headwaters to the Dwaas Kill which is a NYS DEC designated impaired waterway. If any additional exterior lighting is proposed either on the building or within the parking area it must be included on the plan. If no additional lighting is proposed a note stating such must be added to the plan. The applicant should add the number of parking spaces provided and the number of parking spaces required per the Town Code to the site statistics table. The applicant should provide clarification regarding when proposed additions previously approved will be constructed. The site data shows 30,259 SF previously approved; however, prior approvals and the current proposal total 30,575 SF. The applicant should verify the existing previously approved building square footage and adjust the site data accordingly. Any variances previously approved for the site should be noted on the plan.

Mr. Bianchi stated that the following comments regarding this project were prepared by M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. after review of the application materials submitted. Mr. Bianchi reported that, based upon review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an "Unlisted" action. Assuming the Planning Board is to request Lead Agency status under SEQRA, the need to undergo a coordinated review is optional. Under a

coordinated review, involved/ interested agencies to be engaged may include, but are not necessarily limited to the following: Saratoga County Planning: 239m referral due to the parcel being within 500 feet of US Route 9. Additional involved/interested agencies may be defined as the project proceeds through the town's regulatory review process. Several comments related to the site plan submitted for review. The project resides within the town's LI 2, Light Industrial zoning district. A review of Section 208-64(B) of the Town Zoning Code indicates that the uses are permitted principal uses within that zone or appropriate use variances have been granted. The proposed lot configuration appears to meet the minimum requirements as outlined in Section 208-65 of the Code. The applicant is asked to provide a summary of required versus provided parking spaces based upon existing, approved, and proposed uses and square footage. The site plan appears to show utilities that extend into the ACOE regulated wetlands which were not shown this way on the last site plan amendment of 2013. There should be confirmation that these activities have been permitted and are not unauthorized disturbances. The positioning of the proposed building is closer to the regulated wetlands than previously shown. Further description of how this will be constructed without impacting the wetlands should be provided. The expansion proposed appears to alter the previously approved fire access routes and may no longer comply with Section 503.1.1 of the Fire Code of New York State which requires an access that extends to within 150 feet (45 720 mm) of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building or facility. While the change of site cover appears minimal, subsequent submissions should include updates to the previously approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. It may also be necessary to amend the NOI for the current site disturbances to include these proposed improvements. Subsequent submissions should include elevations of the proposed building for review by the Planning Board.

Mr. Roy Casper, Chairman of the Trails Subcommittee of the Open Space, Riverfront, and Trails Committee, provided the following comment regarding this application. The applicant should provide a bicycle rack on the site

Ms. Pam Marshall, 5 Fairlawn Court, recommended that the Planning Board deny this application due to the proximity of the proposed building to existing wetlands and Dwaas Kill stream corridor.

Mr. Neubauer, referencing the comment issued by Ms. Reed, asked if the proposed building would meet fire code requirements. Mr. Address stated that the project as designed will provide necessary access for emergency service vehicles. In response to Mr. Ophardt's question regarding the ability of the stormwater management area to handle additional flows, Mr. Address reported that the facilities are adequate and noted that the stormwater management design for the site significantly improved site drainage which is now captured before discharge to the stream. Mr. Ferraro asked for assurance that the "disturbed area be clearly defined before any additional work is undertaken." Citing Mr. Myers' comment regarding identified LC zoning boundaries, Mr. Andarawis questioned the validity of the boundaries as depicted on the plan. Mr. Address explained that the lines reflected the boundary from the high water mark rather than the "edge of stream." Mr. Ferraro described the issue regarding access and maneuverability through the site for emergency service vehicles as "a significant issue to be addressed."

[2016-027] **Friendly's Drive-Thru** – Proposed construction of a drive-thru lane and window and parking reduction, 815 Route 146 – Conceptual site plan review. SBL: 272.-1-27.2; 271.-3-65.1

Mr. Patrick Mitchell, consultant for the applicant, presented this application that calls for the construction of a drive-thru window, dedicated drive-thru lane, and reduction in the existing number of parking spaces at the Friendly's Restaurant bordered by NYS Route 146 on the south, Clifton Country Road Extension on the east, and Old Route 146 to the north. The project involves improvement of a pre-existing, non-conforming use on a parcel is situated within the recently-created TC-6 zoning district. The speaker explained that the parcel totals approximately 1.24 acres: .80 acres of disturbance is proposed. Though the topography of the site is relatively flat, it does slope slightly to the west. Public utilities currently serve the site with water, sewer, electric, and stormwater drainage. Mr. Mitchell explained that the proposed addition of a drive-thru window will require reconfiguration of the existing parking lot. The plan calls for sixty-seven (67) parking spaces, including four (4) accessible spaces, a reduction from the existing eighty-one (81) spaces. The drive-thru lane provides for the stacking of three (3) vehicles at the menu order board and an additional three (3) vehicles between the menu board and the pick-up window. Open space areas will be increased. No change in parking demand or vehicular trips are expected. The existing westerly curb cut onto Old Route 146 will be relocated to an area further to the west.

Mr. Scavo explained that Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, offered several comments in a memo dated May 18, 2016. He observed that the business "already has parking issues" and the elimination of fourteen (14) spaces will "make the situation worse." A drive-thru on the lot interior as opposed to the lot edge will create traffic flow issues especially if the line extends beyond the drive-thru lane. The drive-thru eliminates access for emergency vehicles to that side of the building which is where the kitchen is located. Handicapped parking will now have to cross the driving path coming out of the drive-thru. The parcel is zoned TC-6. Since the code requires an 80' parking setback, the reconfiguration of the parking lot triggers several parking setback issues. The existing building does not meet zoning setbacks.

Mr. Scavo explained that Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician, offered the following comment regarding this application in a memo dated May 20, 2016. The applicant should supply a narrative on how the stormwater runoff will convey and not impact vehicular or pedestrian travel ways.

Mr. Scavo explained that the ECC offered no comment on this application after review of the project plan at its May 24, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Scavo offered the following comments issued by the Planning Department. A site data table should be added to the plan which compares the following: existing parking spaces to proposed parking spaces; existing green space to proposed green space; existing impervious surface area to proposed impervious surface area; existing building square footage to proposed building square footage. The project appears to have the potential for a gain in greenspace with the elimination of an existing curb cut and relocation and elimination of existing parking spaces. The proposed drive-thru appears to be in an area consisting of existing impervious surface. The proposed use is allowed within the TC-6 zoning district by way of the granting of a Special Use

Permit with site plan approval from the Planning Board. Mr. Scavo stated his appreciation for the applicant's proposed pedestrian connections by way of a sidewalk to connect to existing sidewalk connections adjacent to the project site.

Mr. Bianchi reported that, after review of the materials submitted for conceptual review, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. provided the following comments. Based upon review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an "Unlisted" action. Assuming the Planning Board is to request Lead Agency status under SEQRA, the need to undergo a coordinated review is optional. Under a coordinated review, involved/interested agencies to be engaged may include, but are not necessarily limited to the following: Saratoga County Planning: 239m referral due to the parcel being within 500 feet of NYS Route 146. Additional involved/interested agencies may be defined as the project proceeds through the town's regulatory review process. Several comments related to the site plan. The project located within the town's TC-6 - Boulevard zone. The proposal for exterior parking lot improvements and drive-thru may be considered as ancillary to the existing principal use. It is noted that Table 3-1 of the Form Based Code (FBC) identifies a drive-thru, either as part of a bank or retail operation as subject to a special use. The project appears to propose no exterior renovations to the existing building. As such, a review of the Form Based Code (FBC) as it relates to form and architectural guidelines and standards has not been completed. There may be a need to discuss further with the Planning Board the degree to which the exterior features of the site need to conform to the TC-6 exterior improvement standards. Specific items that may need to be discussed are (1) location and width of various pedestrian improvements outlined in the TC-6 bulk tables (2) streetscape enhancements associated with the Boulevard South area and (3) site standards (Chapter 7 of the FBC). Pursuant to Section 2.3 of the FBC, the Planning Board does have the ability to make modifications to various dimensional requirements if deemed appropriate. Depending on the extent of renovations (if any) planned for the existing building, there may be a need to bring the existing site lighting of the property into conformity with Section 7.6 of the FBC. The applicant is asked to identify the extent of renovations (if any) planned for the existing building to determine whether or not site lighting modifications are required. There should be consideration of placing the relocated accessible parking spaces closer to the accessible entrance to the building. The accessible parking spaces shall include pavement parking and signage that conform to the most current New York State specific requirements. The applicant must provide details for the newly constructed dumpster enclosures. It is suggested an improved enclosure be provided from what exists today which is chain link with privacy slats. The proposed sidewalk along the project frontage creates a mid-block crossing, which is not the most desirable condition. There should be consideration of extending this sidewalk along the opposite side of Old Route 146 if adequate room within the right-of-way exists. This will provide a continuous path to the east intersection with Clifton Country Road Extension, where there is a controlled intersection and pedestrians can cross safely. If this option is not viable, there may be a need to provide preemptive warning signs in advance of the mid-block crossing. If the above modification to the public sidewalk is considered viable, the project should still provide a pedestrian linkage to the sidewalk along Clifton Country Road Extension.

Mr. Roy Casper, Chairman of the Trails Subcommittee of the Open Space, Riverfront, and Trails Committee, explained that the Subcommittee offered the following comments regarding this application. The applicant should provide a sidewalk from the proposed new sidewalk along Old

Route 146 to the existing sidewalk at the front entrance of Friendly's Restaurant for safe and convenient pedestrian access to the restaurant. This is important since the existing sidewalk on the west side of Friendly's will be eliminated by the proposed drive-thru. The applicant should also extend the existing sidewalk along Clifton Country Road to the intersection of NYS Route 146 and Clifton Country Road for safe and convenient pedestrian access to and from the intersection. The applicant should provide a bicycle rack for bicycle parking near the building's entranceway.

Board members discussed the issue of sidewalk improvements and the most feasible locations for their installation. Mr. Scavo pointed out that such improvements may be difficult to install due to the presence of a NYSDOT stormwater drainage area at the southeasterly corner of the site. He explained that future improvements will likely be dependent upon NYSDOT's plans for improvements to the Route 146 corridor. Mr. Scavo noted that the possible approval of a local hotel tax may provide an additional funding source for construction of amenities such as sidewalks within the town center area. Mr. Mitchell took note of Mr. Ophardt's comment regarding the necessity for the crosswalks shown at the entrance and exit to the drive-thru since they apparently did not connect to any type of walkways. In response to Mr. Ophardt's question concerning site landscaping, Mr. Mitchell stated that a comprehensive landscaping plan will be provided with the preliminary submission. Asked if sight distance would be an issue at the new driveway location, Mr. Mitchell stated that it was unlikely that the distances would be an issue. Mr. Neubauer commented that he would not favor "increasing the non-conformity of the site." Although he cited regulating plan requirements that mandated the construction of a storefront to the build-to line, he supported the incremental plan that includes sidewalk installation and connectivity as well as plantings and fencing along both Route 146 and Clifton Country Road Extension, since these improvements would "eventually provide a pleasant walk" and make the area look more like those sites envisioned for the town center zoning district. Mr. Ferraro agreed to the need for additional landscaping along the roadway corridors. Mr. Ferraro expressed his appreciation to the applicant for incorporating connectivity and additional landscaping in the site design and stated that he would prefer that the applicant extend the existing sidewalk along the northerly side of Old Route 146 in lieu of the proposed mid-block crosswalk illustrated on the sketch plan. He asked that the applicant consult with Ms. Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator, to determine the most feasible locations for sidewalks and internal connections. Mr. Scavo explained that a public hearing would be conducted at the preliminary stage of review since the code called for approval of a Special Use Permit for a new drive-thru.

Mr. Ophardt moved, seconded by Mr. Neubauer, adjournment of the meeting at 8:40p.m. The motion was unanimously carried. The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on June 14, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,

Janis Dean, Secretary