

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
June 14, 2016

Those present at the June 14, 2016 Planning Board meeting were:

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

Those absent were: A. Neubauer

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

Mr. Ferraro announced that Mr. Jones would be sitting as a full voting member of the Board at this evening's meeting in Mr. Neubauer's absence.

Minutes Approval:

Mr. Ophardt moved, seconded by Ms. Bagramian, approval of the minutes of May 31, 2016 as written. The motion was unanimously carried.

Public Hearings:

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

Old Business:

[2016-018] **Hockford, Le** - Public hearing for Special Use Permit #81077 to permit the construction of a two-family dwelling within the CR zoning district, 254 Sugar Hill Road – Preliminary site plan review and possible determination. SBL: 282.-1-12

Mr. Ferraro explained the review process to those present, stating that the Planning Board issued a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA for this application at its May 10, 2016 meeting. At that time the Board also conducted and closed the required public hearing.

Ms. Le Hockford, applicant, introduced Mr. Mark Bergeron, civil engineer and consultant and together they presented this application that remains generally as presented at the May 10, 2016 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Bergeron explained that the applicant requests approval to make minor renovations – the installation of a doorway in place of an existing window and conversion of an existing garage to a small living space – to create a two-family residence within the CR (Conservation Residential) zoning district.

Mr. Ferraro expressed his frustration with the applicant's failure to present the Planning Board with detailed plans that would allow for a comprehensive review of the proposed building renovations and site improvements. In response, Ms. Hockford presented the Board with a number of photographs of the existing residence. There was an insufficient number of images presented for each Board member to have a copy for review and the photographs were not arranged in any kind of order that would indicate how the proposed exterior changes would alter the property and were not accompanied by a narrative or sketch plan that would explain how the changes would make the building function better as a two-family dwelling. Mr. Ferraro also noted that the driveway installed prior to town approvals appeared to access a "future garage," yet no construction plans or façade renderings for that building were presented. No detailed site plan or landscaping plan indicating the preservation or removal of existing vegetation were presented. Ms. Hockford explained that there were no plans to construct a new garage on the property or make any changes to the existing landscaping at this time. Mr. Ferraro countered that, if that is the case, the proposed accessory building should be removed from the plan submitted.

Mr. Scavo explained that he had sent a comment letter to the applicant following the May 10, 2016 Planning Board meeting that clearly outlined Board members' concerns expressed at that meeting. At Mr. Ferraro's request, he read the letter which requested a "more detailed" site plan that would include the following: existing and proposed driveway locations; identification of trees to be removed from the site; a proposed planting plan; descriptions of any exterior changes to the building in relation to pertinent interior building design plans. In the correspondence to the applicant Mr. Scavo explained that the confusion exhibited by Board members regarding site design elements stemmed from the fact that they had been supplied with two plan sets: one large-sized print which did not show the proposed second driveway and a smaller drawing which did include the new access drive. Mr. Scavo pointed out that the Planning Board requested that no additional garage structure be constructed without Planning Board approval: such a notation should be added to the plan. In his letter of May 13, 2016 Mr. Scavo explained to the applicant that although it is not required to have design professionals represent her, it is strongly recommended since such professional consultants are well versed in answering questions

presented to them and providing “a level of detail that is expected of applicants” who come before the Board. Mr. Scavo stated that it appeared that the materials submitted by the applicant for this meeting apparently address all his prior technical comments, though he explained that it was the Planning Board that would determine whether or not the documents submitted adequately satisfied their concerns.

Mr. Koval explained that the Planning Board was unable to move forward on this application due to the lack of a detailed site plan, building façade renderings that would clearly illustrate the proposed alterations to the residence, and landscaping plan that would illustrate vegetation to be removed or installed. He noted that, since the public hearing was conducted and closed on May 10, 2016, the 62-day timeframe for rendering a decision was moving. In order for the application to remain pending, it would be necessary for Ms. Hockford, applicant, to waive the deadline requirement at this meeting. Advised by her consultant, Ms. Hockford agreed to waive the deadline, authorize the preparation of a complete site design by a professional, and submit the comprehensive plan for Board review when it was ready. Mr. Koval did point out that, even if the plan was deemed complete at a future meeting, the Board could determine that certain mitigations for impacts may be required and that the Board could impose certain conditions of approval on the application.

[2016-020] **Boni Enterprises, LLC** - Proposed (9) lot subdivision, 309 Miller Road – Revised conceptual review. SBL: 276.-2-34.2

Mr. Scott Lansing, consultant for the applicant, presented this application that was last reviewed by the Planning Board on April 12, 2016 with the caveat that the applicant was aware that the plan presented was not prepared with enough detail to be considered a preliminary plan: this appearance before the Planning Board was simply to provide members with an “update” of design plans. Providing a brief overview of the project plan, he explained that the applicant proposes the subdivision of 12.06 acres of land situated on the easterly side of Miller Road approximately one-half mile north of its intersection with Grooms Road into nine (9) single-family residential lots. The property to be subdivided is located within the R1 zoning district. Each lot will be serviced by municipal water supplied by the Clifton Park Water Authority and an individual wastewater treatment system. All stormwater will be managed and treated on site in accordance with New York State Department of Environmental Conservation standards and regulations. Approximately 811 linear feet of roadway will be constructed. It is the applicant’s intention to dedicate that roadway to the Town of Clifton Park. Mr. Lansing explained that the applicant was granted an area variance for bulk lot size by the Zoning Board of Appeals on January 5, 2016, allowing for a minimum lot size within the development of 30,000 SF. Mr. Lansing expressed confidence that all items of concern outlined in the review letters can be adequately addressed in future submissions. He particularly noted that, in response to Board comments at the April 12, 2016 meeting, the location of the proposed homes on Lots #1, 2, 3, and 4 have been adjusted, the street light as required at the intersection of the new street and Miller Road has been added to the plans, the sketch plan has been updated to illustrate how there would be room for future homeowners to add a pool and/or shed to Lot #4 beyond restrictive buffers, the right-of-way has been shown in the southeasterly portion of the parcel, and the water line design has been revised to include information regarding its possible future extension.

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, provided the following comments in a memo dated June 3, 2016. Since test pit locations have not been shown on the plan, the elevation of groundwater is not known. Evident mottling at 12"-24" would indicate the presence of high groundwater levels on the site. Basement floor elevations should ensure clearance above groundwater table as the proposed fill systems for septic appear to. Elevations for both should be clearly shown on the plans. Separation of basement floors and bases of septic systems to groundwater must be shown on the plans. 9' deep cisterns would seem impractical considering the high ground water. The cistern detail shows a "pump output line" but does not show where it "outputs" to. The number of cisterns to be located on each property must be indicated on the plan. The stormwater basin (if allowed) will require fencing since there is no safety bench. More elevations at the outlet control structure are needed. Approval from the Highway Department for discharge to a town ditch is required since it appears that even the one year storm will produce discharge. The basin bottom cannot interface with groundwater.

Mr. Scavo reported that Ms. Reed, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention, asked that the proposed street name be provided for accurate postal verification purposes.

Mr. Scavo explained that the ECC provided the following comments regarding this application following review at its June 7, 2016 meeting. The ECC recommends that the Planning Board request a deed restriction prohibiting any development activity in the wetland and wetland buffer on Lots #2 – 7. In addition, the wetland buffer should be marked with split rail fencing and/or signage. The separation distances between the leach fields on Lots #2 and 3 and Lots #5 and 6 are a concern and the ECC asks that the applicant address what the minimum separation distance should be for proper operation. The ECC is concerned with the elevation of the high water table (mottling) in relation to the septic field locations.

Mr. Scavo reported that, after review of the preliminary subdivision plans submitted by the applicant, Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician, offered numerous comments. Per the Individual Residential Wastewater Treatment Systems Design Handbook – Table 2 – Required Separation Distances from Wastewater System Components – drainage ditches shall be located 20' from all absorption fields and raised or mound systems: the applicant shall verify that this separation distance is being met. The applicant is asked to describe the method to be used for indefinitely preserving the vegetative buffer along the wetlands and adjacent parcels. The applicant is planning to construct a stormwater management area that will be 10 feet deep adjacent to Miller Road: it is recommended that the applicant consult with the Clifton Park Highway Department to determine whether or not a guide rail should be constructed between the roadway and the stormwater management area. On sheet DT-6, detail 2 - Basin 4 Cross Section - the groundwater elevation and the seasonal high water elevation should be shown. The heavy line located under the 4" of topsoil should be identified. The method for handling the water quality from the back side of the homes must be addressed. On the Proposed Conditions Plan the drainage

for the homes on Lots #2 through 9 are all supposed to drain towards the front. If the roofs for these residences will have gutter systems, a note should be added to the plans that will ensure that this will be done. The applicant should explain why the existing conditions lawn areas are described as fair with 50-75% grass cover and the proposed conditions for the same undisturbed area with greater than 75% grass cover is described as good since this affects the weighted curve number average and runoff numbers. Mr. Reese provided a number of technical comments that the applicant was asked to address at the next submission. The test pit location numbers on the plans shall coordinate with Soil Appraisal Table on the Existing Conditions by Lansing Engineering. Section 2.9 - Endangered Species & Archeological Sensitive Areas of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention report refers to a map which can be found in Appendix B: there is no map in Appendix B. Under section 5.1 Site Planning – Preservation of Undisturbed Areas it states that 28.50 acres will be included within a permanent conservation area: this will need to be corrected. Under section 5.2 - Determine the Water Quality Volume and Minimum Reduction Volume, under the Minimum RRv the applicant is required to correct S, A and the decimal location in the calculation formula. Under section 6.3 - Proposed Water Quantity and Quality Controls, the orifice discharge design point location as described in the 7th paragraph must be corrected. Under section 11.0 - Post Construction Inspection and Maintenance the location of the O and M Manual item 2 in the 3rd paragraph must be corrected. On sheet LMG-1 the applicant is asked to correctly tie in proposed elevation 107 on Lots #1, 3 and 6. On sheet ESC-1, under Particular Measures, item #6 refers to a sheet that is not included. On sheet DT-5, the applicant must provide the check dam detail as indicated on sheet ESC-1. On sheet DT-6, the applicant must complete detail 1 - Stormwater Management Basin #1 and correct the scale. On sheet DT-6, detail 3 – Basin #1, the outlet structure with an anti-seep collar should show the two anti-seep collars per the note. The outlet pipe information will need to be completed. On sheet DT-6, detail 4 – Forebay Dam/Weir Section the basin slope should be shown and dimensions included to match as shown in detail 2.19. Sheet DT-6, detail 7 – Spillway Cross Section should show the dimension of the spillway crest.

Mr. Scavo offered numerous comments prepared by the Planning Department. Since the project is within the boundaries of Saratoga County Consolidated Agricultural District #2, the preliminary application has been forwarded to the Saratoga County Planning Board (SCPB) for a recommendation. It is expected that the application will be considered at that Board's June 16, 2016 meeting. The proposed roadway name should be displayed on the final plat and verification for acceptance of the roadway name from Sheryl Reed, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention should be provided. Assigned 911 addresses should also be shown and displayed on the final subdivision plat. The applicant is asked to add a note to the plan that states, "No further subdivision allowed." The applicant has provided a standard detail for the installation of a cluster mailbox as required by the United States Postal Service. The location for installation of the cluster mailbox should be shown and documentation should be provided which demonstrates that the location is acceptable to the Clifton Park Postmaster. Sheet CV-1- Note #40, should be reviewed for applicability to this project. Sheet CV-1 – Site Statistics notes the minimum lot size is 40,000 SF; however, the next line states the smallest lot is 30,119 SF: the applicant should correct the site statistics table and add the date and Project ID# for the area variance granted by the ZBA including the relief granted. On Sheet SV-1, the applicant is asked to add a notation for the installation of a "Future Thru Street" sign to be placed at the end of the cul-de-sac. An example of such signage is provided below:



The land area to be dedicated to the Town for the future thru-street should be incorporated into the roadway right-of-way and not be created as a separate lot. Sheet SV-1, shows the smallest residential lot size created to be 30,014 which is different from the smallest lot size reported on Sheet CV-1 within the site statistics table. The NYSDEC Wetland and 100' Buffer adjacent to Lot #5 shown on Sheet EC-1 should also be displayed on Sheet SV-1. Add a note to the plan that states:

There shall be no clearing, grading, construction, or disturbance of soil and/or native vegetation until the final plat has been approved and filed with the Saratoga County Clerk's Office, all fees have been paid, and an irrevocable letter of credit has been posted.

To establish the letter of credit value for the public infrastructure improvements, the applicant must provide a copy of the engineer's itemized construction estimate for all public infrastructure improvements. On Sheet DT-1, the type of asphalt layer should be changed from NYS DOT Type 7 to Type 6. A concrete sidewalk is shown on the detail cross section on Sheet DT-1: such an improvement has not been proposed for this project to date. On Sheet DT-5, the typical lot layout detail shows a sewer lateral instead of the proposed private septic system to be used on each residential lot. Mr. Scavo deferred to the Town's Stormwater Management Officer and Town Engineer to determine if a fence around the stormwater management area as shown on Sheet DT-6 will be required due to the depth of the basin. Sheet DT-6 – Basin 4 Cross Section Detail, contains a note that states, "An easement shall be granted to the Town of Clifton Park for the Operation and Maintenance of the proposed Stormwater Management Areas," though it appears from the subdivision plan that no easements are necessary since ownership of the stormwater land areas will be conveyed to the town.

Mr. Bianchi reported that, after review of the information and subdivision plan provided for this application, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. offered a number of comments and recommendations. As noted in Comment 14 of the April 8, 2016 review letter, Section 86-6(E)(5) of the Town Code requires that street lighting be provided at the intersection of subdivision streets and an existing arterial or collector street. Subsequent plans may need to show a street light at the intersection with Miller Road, if deemed appropriate for the existing setting. The applicant is asked to provide notation On Sheet EC-1 that the existing septic system for the home shall be located and abandoned in accordance with NYSDOH standards. The area for the stormwater lot should be identified on the stormwater lot and note added that states that it will be conveyed to the Town of Clifton Park. For the area planned for the extension of a future right-of-way, erect a conspicuous sign notifying future land owners of the possibility of a future roadway extension. The location of the proposed cisterns must be shown on the plans. The location of the proposed mail kiosk must be indicated on the plan. There is a proposed 15-foot wide easement to be granted

to the Town along Miller Road, presumably for a future trail. The grading associated with the stormwater pond may preclude the future construction of this multi-use trail. There should be discussions with the Town's Trails Committee to review this condition to determine what plan modifications are possible so not to limit or prohibit future trail construction. Test pits completed throughout the site for the septic systems indicate mottling (or seasonal high groundwater) at approximately 24 inches below existing grade. The grading plan suggests that homes with basements will be close to - if not below - seasonal high groundwater. There may be a need to raise finished floor elevations to provide a minimum of 2-feet of vertical separation from seasonal high groundwater. The test pits shown on the plans are all labeled "TP1". Test pits should be accurately labeled so that data for each test pit may be examined against specific improvements proposed. The septic system shown on Lot #9 appears to be within 100 feet of the permanent pool elevation of the stormwater pond. Table 2 of Appendix 75A of the State Sanitary Code requires a minimum of 100-feet between the absorption field and a stream, lake, watercourse, or wetland. There needs to be a discussion with the NYSDOH to verify whether the stated separation of 100 feet is applicable in this instance. The proposed 12 inch culvert at the intersection of Road A and Miller road appears to have less than 12 inches of cover. The culvert shall have sufficient cover to withstand H-20 loading. The applicant is asked to confirm that the depth shown is sufficient for the stated loading conditions. The applicant is asked to provide a generic detail for the sump pump arrangement based upon expected field conditions and finished floors of the proposed homes. Based upon the elevation of stored runoff within the stormwater pond, there are instances where the upgradient storm sewer will be subject to flooding and backwater conditions. For the 10 year event, the storm sewer will be subject to backwater conditions from the stormwater pond to CB6. For the 100 year event, the storm sewer will be subject to backwater conditions to CB5 and beyond. The applicant is asked to confirm that these flooded conditions will not compromise system operations. It is proposed to utilize sheet flow to riparian buffers as a GI practice for Lots #2 through 5. Based upon proposed grading for Lot #5, it appears that the swale to be constructed between the home and septic system will result in channelized flow prior to runoff entering the buffer area. The applicant is asked to confirm that this lot grading will result in runoff entering the buffer as overland sheet flow as required in Section 5.3.1 of the NYSSMDM. Use of a level spreader on this lot may be warranted. Tree plantings are proposed as one of the GI practices to be utilized. The location, caliper and species type to be installed should be shown on the plans. Sheet ESC-1 indicates that the total area of disturbance will be slightly over 5 acres. Please indicate how site disturbances will remain below 5 acres via delineation of phased disturbance limits. The portions of the project site designated as being part of conservation of natural areas shall show structural barriers that delineate its boundaries pursuant to Section 5.3.1 of the NYSSMDM. Provide a landscaping plan for the aquatic bench required within the P-1 stormwater practice pursuant to Section 6.1.5 of the NYSSMDM. Sheet ESC-1 proposed check dams: provide a detail for this measure within the plan set. Modify Detail 1/DT-1 based upon the conditions proposed for the project. On Detail 1/DT-6:

- a. Identify the location of the access road
- b. Identify the location of the split rail fence and gate
- c. Identify location of facility notification sign
- d. Identify the location of the sediment marker
- e. Correct the map scale as it does not appear to be correct
- f. Identify the emergency spillway elevation and top of berm elevation of basin

Detail 2/DT-6 has a note indicating that an easement shall be granted to the Town of Clifton Park. It is believed that the stormwater pond shall be on its own parcel and an easement is not necessary. The applicant is asked to clarify whether or not an easement will be required. Outlet pipe design information on Detail 3/DT-6 must be provided. The dimension of the spillway crest on Detail 7/DT-6 matching what was modeled in HydroCAD must be labeled. A detail for the proposed vegetative swale that includes the structural and finished surface must be provided as per Section 5.3.1 of the NYSSMDM.

Several of Mr. Bianchi's comments concerned the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Section 2.9 of the SWPPP indicates that Appendix B provides information relative to threatened and endangered species and archeological resources; however, Appendix B contains the project site location map and drainage maps. The noted information does not appear to exist within the SWPPP and needs to be furnished to demonstrate eligibility under GP-0-15-002. Section 5.1 of the SWPPP notes 28.5 acres planned for conservation, which does not match the 1.45 acres noted on page 19 of the SWPPP and GI calculations found in the appendix. Section 5.4 identifies Conservation of Natural Areas as one of the GI practices to be utilized. The applicant is asked to provide a draft of the required conservation easement instrument that ensures perpetual protection pursuant to Section 5.3.1 of the NYSSMDM. Design information must be provided within the SWPPP for the vegetative swale including (1) that it will convey the peak discharge for water volume flow and (2) can convey the 10 year storm event with 6-inches of freeboard at a velocity less than 5 fps as noted in Section 5.3.1 of the NYSSMDM. With the number of GI practices being proposed on individual lots, it is recommended that lot-specific operation and maintenance manuals be developed and provided to future landowners. Further, deed restrictions should be developed for any of the area based GI practices to ensure future actions by landowners will not compromise the functionality of these practices. Section 2.3 of the SWPPP indicates that as a result of soil testing, the A soils have been treated as C soils for modeling purposes. The HydroCAD model provided indicates some of the CN numbers are for the A soil groups (see existing and proposed conditions Subcatchment 1S). The piping sizing calculations are not included in Appendix D of the SWPPP. The Cistern Barrel worksheet provided in Appendix D indicates 5 are being proposed. Lots which will include the noted cisterns should be identified on the plan sheets. The O and M checklists included in Appendix H should be edited to include only those practices being utilized. The applicant is asked to provide the O and M requirements for the GI practices being proposed within Appendix H. The NOI provided in Appendix J has not been completed for review. The following comment related to the Water Report provided with the application. Review indicates that the existing water system has adequate conditions to meet both the domestic and fire protection needs of the project. M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. would defer to the Clifton Park Water Authority on the completion of a more comprehensive technical review of this document.

Mr. Bill Lorensen, 14 Hearthside Drive, asked when the ECC comments would become requirements. Mr. Ferraro explained that the ECC is an advisory board whose comments are "weighed" by Board members. If comments and/or recommendations are deemed appropriate or necessary, the Board asks that they either be incorporated in a future plan or makes them conditions of approval. Noting that the subdivision plan required non-disturbance, restrictive development areas on several of the proposed lots, Mr. Lorensen commented that it was his understanding that it was a recent Board policy to require that all deed restrictions indicated on a subdivision plan be

incorporated in individual deeds of transfer. Mr. Scavo agreed that this was indeed the recommended policy.

Mr. David West, 10 Herold Drive, explained that he was required to install a raised bed septic system on his adjoining property and questioned whether or not the Planning Board would permit the installation of a trench system on the existing grades as proposed. Mr. Lansing explained that soil conditions indicated that the installation of either shallow trench or conventional septic systems would be feasible. In response to Mr. West's question regarding wetland disturbances, Mr. Koval explained that the subdivision plan proposed no clearing or development within designated wetland areas. Mr. Ferraro noted that NYSDEC wetlands and 100' adjacent buffer areas were regulated by that agency.

Mr. Roy Casper, Chairman of the Trails Subcommittee of the Open Space, Trails, and Riverfront Committee, offered the following recommendations. The applicant should provide a trail easement and construct a 10-foot wide asphalt multi-use trail along Miller Road. A 10-foot wide multi-use trail already exists on the east side of Miller Road north of this property. Landscaping should be provided as a buffer between the trail and Lot #1 and also between the trail and the proposed stormwater management area. The applicant should also provide a right-of-way for a future multi-use trail off the proposed residential subdivision cul-de-sac where there is approximately 100' between Lots #6 and 7. A future trail in this area would connect the proposed subdivision with existing homes located on Herold Drive. He acknowledged that the current plan includes the requested connection.

Mr. Scott Callender, 311 Miller Road, adjoining property owner, stated that he was required to install a "full fill septic system" on his property and he questioned whether there was a flaw in the design for septic systems proposed for the residences to be constructed on the cul-de-sac. He asked that the Board "carefully scrutinize" the proposed septic designs. Mr. Scavo pointed out that the individual septic system designs must be approved by NYSDOH. Mr. Lansing attested to the fact that NYDOH representatives had witnessed all test pit studies. Mr. Koval explained that, in addition to these reviews, the designs must be acceptable to Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development. In response to Mr. West's comment that all properties surrounding this parcel have required "more intensive systems," Mr. Bianchi explained that soil conditions vary rapidly over short distances. Mr. Prescott supported this observation, stating that he had just replaced a system and that, indeed, soil conditions on his approximately one-acre parcel varied substantially from the front to the rear of the property.

Mr. Koval asked that, if possible, the proposed homes be moved closer to the front property lines since potential owners preferred larger back yards than front yards: this, in his opinion, would particularly apply to Lots #1, 2, and 3. Mr. Lansing agreed to reconsider the house locations though he noted that the house location for Lot #4 would be restricted by the wetland buffer boundaries. In response to Mr. Ophardt's request to "shift" the stormwater management area along Miller Road a bit to the east, Mr. Lansing agreed that such a move would better allow the installation of a future pathway. Mr. Ophardt commented on the unlikely location of the termination of the water main: Mr. Lansing reported that accurate terminus has been shown on the updated plan.

Mr. Callender reported that he has an existing “agricultural pond” on his property and asked if the applicant will be required to install split-rail fencing and/or provide signage to “prevent unrestricted access” to the buffer areas which adjoin his land. Mr. Ferraro explained that the Board often requests the installation of staggered split-rail fencing and/or signage, as appropriate, to prevent disturbance of these areas.

Mr. Ferraro summarized the Board’s concerns, asking that future submissions clearly identify wetland buffer zones and include staggered split-rail fencing and signage to define boundaries, note that the 15’ right-of-way easement along the Miller Road frontage is to provide for future trail development or roadway improvements, provide a dedicated space for a mailbox facility, and address the status of the stone path that meanders through the parcel. Mr. Lansing explained that since the stone pathway is generally located with the wetland buffer areas, it will not be disturbed.

New Business:

[2016-031] **DCG Development – Town Plaza Drive-Thru** – Renovation of existing Building 100 and reconfiguration of existing parking areas to accommodate a drive-thru restaurant use, 300 Clifton Corporate Parkway – Conceptual site plan review. SBL: 271.-3-33.73

Mr. Joe Dannible, consultant for the applicant, introduced Mr. Donald MacElroy, DCG representative, and Mr. Joshua Silver, legal representative from the Murray Law firm who were in attendance at the meeting. He then presented this application that calls for the reconfiguration of an existing parking area to accommodate a drive-thru restaurant use. The property is located at 300 Clifton Corporate Parkway, specifically located on the southerly side of Route 146 just west of its intersection with Maxwell Drive. The parcel is located within the TC-3 zoning district. Mr. Dannible explained that the existing office complex is being updated to include both office and retail uses in accordance with guidelines outlined in the form-based code. To meet the needs of a potential tenant proposing a fast-food restaurant use, the applicant has applied for site plan approval that includes the redesign of the parking area adjacent to building 100. The proposal calls for the elimination of several parking places and the construction of a drive-thru lane to the south and east of the building. Stacking for eight (8) vehicles before the order board and at least four (4) approaching the service window have been shown on the plan. An escape lane has been provided. Mr. Dannible explained that directional signage would be placed as needed throughout the site. The speaker reported that, as a result of an on-site meeting with Mr. Scavo and Ms. Viggiani, it was determined that the best location(s) for a sidewalk connection into the site from the Route 146 frontage to the internal network would be at the existing main access into the site from Route 146 or at the most easterly side of the site. He noted that excessive grade changes along Route 146 and the northerly portion of the property prohibits sidewalk installation. Images of the changes to the buildings’ external facades which illustrated the 14’ high stonework features, awnings over sidewalks, and landscaping features were presented for the Board’s consideration. Mr. Dannible stated that he was in receipt of comments issued regarding the application and expressed confidence that all concerns could be adequately addressed.

Mr. Scavo reported that Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, offered the following comments. The parcel is situated within the TC-3 zoning district. The proposed

restaurant drive-thru is a permitted use. Since the existing building was constructed prior to the zoning change, it does not appear to meet many of the new setback requirements. Variances may be required. Additional comments will be forthcoming when a more detailed site plan is presented.

Mr. Scavo reported that Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician, offered the following comment on this application. The applicant shall show the existing stormwater management area that is in the southeastern portion of the property as shown on the plans titled "Route 146 Office Park – Phase II", last revised May 19, 1989, since it does not appear on the current site plan. The applicant should indicate if site modifications will or will not impact this stormwater basin.

Mr. Scavo offered comments prepared by the Planning Department. Although the Planning Board does not issue signage permits as part of the site plan approval, any proposed signage should be shown. Pursuant to code requirements of the TC-3 Zone, "Where a building façade steps back or is absent from the build-to zone (BTZ), the BTZ line should be maintained and defined by fence, landscape wall, or hedge 30"-54" high." There appears to be a 12'+/- difference from the front parking area to the higher roadway elevation of NYS Route 146. The Planning Board and applicant should discuss what landscaping opportunities exist on the project site for viable enhancements that may contribute to the overall visual appeal within the Town Center. On June 6th Jennifer Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator, and Mr. Scavo had the opportunity to meet at the project site with the applicant. At that time, the applicant agreed to explore a sidewalk connection opportunity from their complex of buildings to connect with the existing sidewalk along NYS Route 146. The applicant, as part of the repurposing of the existing buildings, has widened the prior 5' wide sidewalks to 10' sidewalks around the buildings and exterior façade treatments were added to the existing buildings to create the illusion that the first floors meet the 14' ceiling height requirements for new construction. These changes bring the site into better conformance with the TC-3 zoning standards. The applicant and Mr. Scavo have discussed concerns with a two-way traffic parking aisle serving a dual purpose of a drive-thru lane for vehicles. Specifically, vehicles may be backing into or out of adjacent parking stalls into the aisle that has traffic proceeding to the drive-thru. It was recommended that the applicant modify the concept to provide one way traffic flow with diagonal parking for the back parking aisle. The project has been referred to the Saratoga County Planning Board in accordance with §239m of General Municipal Law.

Mr. Bianchi reported that, after review of the documents and site plan submitted, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. issued 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. Several comments related to the Full Environmental Assessment Form. Part B lists various regulatory approvals being required. Given the limited nature of work shown on the current application, further expansion is warranted as to why several of the regulatory approvals are needed. Of particular interest is the identification of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and permit coverage under GP-0-15-002. If a SWPPP is required due to other

site activities, then it should be submitted for this specific action for review. Several comments related to the proposed site plan. The project is located within the town's TC3 General 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 restaurant operation as a permitted use. Existing buildings within the parcel, in addition to the one which is the subject of this application, are undergoing renovations. Based upon discussions with the town, the applicant has been working with staff in an attempt to make preferred incremental changes to existing building facades to meet the intent of the architectural guidelines and standards for the TC3 district. 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 TC3 exterior improvement 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. The existing site entrance from Route 146, across from Tallow Wood Drive is shown as part of a future perimeter road or multi-use path on the Future Streets Map found in the FBC. It is understood that this application proposed no improvements in the vicinity of this roadway. Notwithstanding, it may be an opportunity to discuss with the applicant how this connection may be facilitated at some future time. 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 needs to be inclusion of traffic regulatory signage that clearly directs traffic to and through the drive-thru so not to impede other traffic flow through the parking lot or result in vehicles utilizing the drive-thru lane as access to other parking areas. With the on-going site improvements occurring, beyond this specific project, there may be an opportunity to provide a pedestrian connection from the existing buildings to the sidewalk along Route 146. This item should be discussed further with the Planning Board and Town staff. Considering the plan submitted is conceptual in nature, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. will reserve further comments until more detailed plans and reports are submitted. Subsequent submissions shall include information as outlined in Section 208-115 of the Town Zoning Code specific to site grading, erosion control, and stormwater management to fully assess the design and its compliance to the applicable standards.

Mr. Roy Casper, Chairman of the Trails Subcommittee of the Open Space, Trails, and Riverfront Committee, in a memo to the Board, offered the following recommendations. A sidewalk should be provided along the main entranceway connecting the existing sidewalk on the south side of Route 146 with the retail/office development sidewalks.

Mr. Werner Classen, 41 Blue Spruce Lane, citing traffic congestion along the Route 146 corridor, asked it would be reasonable to consider the installation of a traffic signal at the site's main entranceway from Route 146 across from Tallow Wood Drive. Mr. Dannible explained that it was likely that existing trips to the office complex site would be "off-set" by the new retail component and he pointed out that there is an existing turn lane in front of the site. He commented that he did not think such a signal was warranted at this time. Though Mr. Ferraro expressed his concerns for increased traffic generated from this site by the drive-thru service during the peak hour travel times in the morning, Mr. Dannible argued that it was unlikely that the drive-thru would

result in any additional peak hour traffic along Route 146 because the business would draw from existing drive-by traffic. Mr. Ophardt stated his concerns regarding traffic conflicts within the aforementioned turning lane. He commented that pass-by lanes usually extend beyond the drive-thru pick-up window. He was also concerned with the sight distances at the internal intersection located just beyond the “order board.” Mr. MacElroy pointed out that the prospective tenant would also be very concerned about the safety of patrons utilizing the drive-thru. Mr. Jones was also concerned about traffic safety due to the location of parking and drive aisles situated near the proposed drive-thru lane.

Mr. Dannible agreed to consider various locations for sidewalk installations, explaining that the site topography made it difficult to meet ADA standards. Mr. Koval asked the applicant to identify any site improvements that may require variances under the new code requirements. Mr. Ferraro and Mr. Jones both commented on greenspace and the landscaping design, asking that landscaping be enhanced along Route 146. Mr. Ferraro stated that he was impressed by the new statuary incorporated in the landscape features throughout the site and encouraged the use of interesting “way-finding” signage: the applicant was admonished to consider “site aesthetics.” In response to Mr. Andarawis’ comment regarding the change in color and texture of the drive-thru lane, Mr. Dannible stated that the applicant was considering a number of color changes and/or pavement patterns.

[2016-033] **Judge, James, D. – Timber Harvesting** – Special Use Permit # 81089 pursuant to Section 184-3 and 208-79 of the Town Code to permit timber harvesting activities, 39 Glenridge Road – Conceptual review. SBL: 269.-1-1.11

Mr. Ferraro explained that this application requests approval to harvest timber on a forty-four (44) acre parcel of land situated within the CR (Conservation Residential) zoning district.

No applicant or consultant was present at the meeting to present this application for the Board’s consideration. Mr. Ferraro commented that “comments from the staff indicated that there was a “significant lack of detail” in the plans presented and several “deficiencies in the application.” Mr. Scavo explained that he had advised the applicant that, although it is not required to have design professionals represent him, it is strongly recommended since such professional consultants are well versed in answering questions presented to them and providing “a level of detail that is expected of applicants” who come before the Board. Mr. Ferraro explained that the application must be submitted in accordance with all of the timber harvesting requirements outlined in Section 184-3(D)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)(7)(8)(9) and (10) of the Town Code.

[2016-032] **Northway Church** - Proposed 45,00SF church facility, southwesterly quadrant of Ushers and Pierce Roads – Conceptual site plan review. SBL: 259.-2-85.3

Mr. Ferraro introduced this application, explaining that, although churches are not specifically identified as permitted uses within the LI zoning district, they are allowed under the Federal Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA) which supersedes local zoning regulations. Mr. Pelagalli explained that though the federal law does allow the construction of a church within the zone, the application is still subject to site plan review and approval by the Planning Board.

Mr. Jeff Buell, church representative and principal at Sequence Development, explained that Northway Church has been operating for the past twelve years from a rental space in North Country Commons. The congregation, led by Pastor “Buddy” Cremeans, now looks to construct a new church facility at the intersection of Ushers and Pierce Roads.

Mr. Scott Lansing, consultant for the applicant, introduced this site plan which calls for the construction of a new church and associated parking on a 6.83 acre parcel located at the southwesterly quadrant of the Ushers Road – Pierce Road intersection. The speaker explained that the applicant for the proposed development is Donald Cremeans. The lot slated for development is currently vacant, forested site and is situated within the LI-1 zoning district. There are no wetlands located on the project site. The application proposes the construction of a 45,000 SF non-denominational church and will include an approximately 7,500 SF outdoor patio/gathering area at the main entrance to the church. Parking will be provided in accordance with Town of Clifton Park zoning requirements which require one (1) space per every four (4) seats in the church. Since the church will have approximately 1,000 seats, the site will require 250 parking spaces. A total of 559 spaces have been proposed to meet anticipated future parking needs. Access will be provided by curb cuts onto Pierce Road and VanPatten Drive. It is expected that the proposed access points and general internal traffic circulation will provide efficient and safe access to the parking areas. Walkways are positioned to provide safe and efficient access for pedestrians. The speaker explained that a traffic impact study will be conducted on this proposed project to evaluate the anticipated trip generations and function with the surrounding roadway infrastructure. Deliveries to the site will be made at the main entrance. The existing vegetation along the existing roadways will be maintained to the greatest extent practicable to buffer the use from surrounding properties. It is expected that general office hours will be Monday through Friday from 9:00a.m. to 4:00p.m. Church services will be provided on Saturday at 6:00p.m. and Sunday at 9:30a.m. and 11:00a.m. Mr. Lansing stated that water service to the facility will be provided by the Clifton Park Water Authority and sewer service by the Saratoga County Sewer District #1. Stormwater will be managed on-site through the use of NYSDEC approved measures. A full Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will be submitted.

Pastor “Buddy” Cremeans, describing Clifton Park as a “gem,” offered an introduction to the church and its mission. He stated that the Clifton Park motto which states that Clifton Park is a “great place to live, work, and play” should be expanded to include “worship.” The church’s mission is to bring a message of hope to all and encourage the values of honor and excellence. Explaining that the church has a diverse congregation, he stated that the church works with people “at every age and stage all striving to improve people’s lives.” He cited the church’s contributions to the CAPTAIN organization and work with veterans as illustrative of its desire to “give back to the community.”

Mr. Scavo stated that Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, offered the following comments regarding this application. The parcel is zoned LI-1 (Light Industrial One). A church or house of worship is not a permitted use in this zone: it appears that a use variance will be required. Access from Pierce Road is not shown on the site plan as noted.

Mr. Scavo explained that Ms. Reed, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention, asked that the postal verification form be submitted for accurate assignment of the 911 postal address.

Mr. Scavo read the comments and recommendations provided by the ECC regarding this application. In keeping with the recommendations and goals of the Town Comprehensive Plan, the applicant should retain existing vegetation to the maximum extent practical and/or the use landscaping and grading to provide visual and auditory buffering between the project and adjacent roadways or other properties. The applicant should state the amount of greenspace that the proposed project will have. The ECC would like the applicant supply further detail including dimensions for the signage. The ECC would like the applicant to incorporate green infrastructure into the stormwater management plan.

Mr. Scavo stated that Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician, offered the following comments on this application. The concept plan should show the schematic location of the stormwater management areas. If the applicant is proposing underground storage, it should be shown on the plans. The concept plan shows a large amount of continuous asphalt. It is recommended that the asphalt be broken up with green infrastructure practices and tree plantings to minimize the impact of the impervious area.

Mr. Scavo offered comments provided by the Planning Department. Due to the proximity of I-87 and NYSDOT lands, the future preliminary plan will be forwarded to the Saratoga County Planning Board for their consideration. Per §208-114a of the Town Code, the property boundaries for the parcel should be shown on the conceptual submittal as well as all properties, subdivisions, streets and easements within 200' of the property boundaries for the parcel. A site statistics table should be provided to show existing and proposed conditions (i.e. existing and proposed - greenspace, parking, asphalt, building area). Landscaping and/or preservation of mature vegetative buffers should be incorporated into the site plan to minimize the visual impacts of the parking field from Ushers and Pierce Roads.

Mr. Bianchi read the comments prepared by M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. regarding this application. The Short Environmental Assessment Form submitted indicates that more than one acre of land will be disturbed. As such, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) addressing water quality, quantity, and green infrastructure is required. The project proposes to provide potable water to the new building from the Clifton Park Water Authority (CPWA). The applicant shall provide the Town documentation indicating the CPWA's ability and willingness to provide additional potable water to the project. Any approvals offered by the Planning Board should be conditioned on receipt of CPWA's review and approval. The project proposes to provide sanitary sewer service to the new building from the Town of Clifton Park Sewer District via the existing service lateral to the property. Since the Town's sewer district ultimately discharges to the Saratoga County Sewer District No. 1 (SCSD) it is believed that the applicant would be required to request additional reserve capacity from the SCSD. If this is the case, the applicant shall provide the Town documentation indicating the SCSD's ability and willingness to provide additional sewer capacity to the project. Any approvals granted by the Planning Board should be conditioned on receipt of SCSD's review and approval. Given the project's location, it is recommended that a traffic impact study be prepared. The study should evaluate (1) peak hour vehicle trips expected; (2) entrance

site distances; (3) existing level of service (LOS) of the proposed intersection at Pierce Road as well as the intersection of Ushers Road and Pierce Road; (4) warrant analysis for a signal or other improvements at the intersection of Ushers Road and Pierce Road; (5) accident reports. This analysis shall account for the full build-out of the adjacent development occurring within the Fairchild Square project. Several comments related to the State Environmental Quality Review documents submitted. 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 Sewer District: additional reserve sewer capacity; Clifton Park Water Authority: taking of additional potable water; Saratoga County Planning: 239m referral due to the parcel being within 500 feet of Interstate 87; NYS Department of Environmental Conservation – NYSDEC Phase II Stormwater Regulations and coverage; NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation: identification of cultural or historic resources. Additional involved/interested agencies may be defined as the project proceeds through the Town’s regulatory review. While the initial assessment of the project suggests that the action to be Unlisted, it is requested that a Full Environmental Assessment Form be provided to further evaluate the project. Upon submission of the FEAF and subsequent review, the action may be elevated to a Type 1 action and thus would have to undergo a coordinated review. One comment related to the Short Environmental Assessment Form. Part I.8.a. indicates that the project will not result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels. At a minimum, the applicant is asked to provide the expected peak hour vehicle trips for review that may support this statement. A number of comments related to the proposed site plan. The project resides within the Town’s L1 (Light Industrial) zoning district. In review of Section 208-64 of the Town’s Zoning Code in its entirety, it appears that the proposed use is not permitted as of right or by special use. As such, a use variance may be necessary in order for the project to proceed further with the Planning Board. In its review of the concept plan submitted, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. is unable to determine whether the project meets the bulk lot requirements of Section 208-65 of the Town’s Zoning. An updated plan shall be submitted that clearly shows parcel boundaries and site statistics. Further, there needs to be justification as to why the project proposed more than twice the number of parking spaces required by the town’s parking standards. For concept site plan submission, Section 208-114(B) of the Town Zoning Code requires topographic information at no more than 10-foot contour intervals. The plan, as submitted, does not provide the required topographic information. If the town is considering this a preliminary submission, additional mapping requirements are needed as outlined in Section 208-115 of the Town Zoning Code. The plan must include information regarding the expected height of the proposed building so that a review of the fire access to the building may be completed. If the building is greater than 30 feet in height, an aerial fire apparatus access road will be required meeting the requirements of Appendix D, Section D105 of the Fire Code of New York State (FCNYS). There needs to be a determination as to whether or not the proposed building construction and use will warrant automatic sprinklers as prescribed in the Building Code of New York State. This information is needed to determine whether or not an on-site hydrant is required to satisfy the requirements of Section 508.8 of the FCNYS. Subsequent submissions shall include information as outlined in Section 208-115 of the Zoning Code specific to lighting, site grading, landscaping, erosion control, and stormwater management to fully assess the design and its compliance to the applicable standards. Elevations and materials of construction for the

proposed building expansion should be submitted to the Planning Board for review. Mr. Bianchi emphasized that it would be important to include an analysis of traffic impacts at the Ushers Road – VanPatten Drive intersection in the traffic study.

Ms. Pam Marshall, 5 Fairlawn Court, asked that, if a traffic study is prepared, that it include traffic generated on a Sunday when all the church services in the area are concluding. She was also concerned that the project may impact an aquifer recharge area that was identified during review of a previous application for development of this parcel in 2004.

Ms. Barbara Hartman, 1 Hillcrest Drive, expressed concerns regarding possible negative impacts to the identified aquifer recharge area on the parcel and to traffic congestion along Ushers Road, citing the issues that arose in 2004 when an Exxon-Mobil service station was proposed for this parcel. She explained that it is often difficult under current conditions to make a left onto the Northway from Ushers Road. She described the project plan as “not feasible.”

Mr. Werner Classen, 41 Blue Spruce Lane, noting that there are “four churches in the area all using Ushers Road – ‘an urban minor arterial with no shoulders’ – on a Sunday morning,” called it a “travesty” to add more traffic to existing flows. He pointed out that the church would be located in close proximity to an operating brewery and distillery.

Mr. Bob Brondi, 12 Ashley Drive, stating that his comments did not reflect on the good things the church brought to the community, pointed out that the construction of many buildings in the area within the past ten years has resulted in a substantial amount of tree clearing and increased traffic congestion. He asked the Board to consider the “totality” of what has been “going on,” citing a decrease in wildlife and wildlife habitat, increased building construction, and increased traffic along Ushers Road. The speaker noted that many of the buildings within the Fairchild complex and along Pierce Road appear to be empty. He asked that the applicant assess the needs of the church community, implying that it may be possible to adapt vacant buildings for a church use.

Mr. Ferraro explained that the improvements made to the Fairchild complex involved many site plan and subdivision applications that the Board conscientiously reviewed. These reviews, he noted, included consideration of existing, potential, and cumulative growth impacts on traffic conditions.

Mr. Roy Casper, Chairman of the Trails Subcommittee of the Open Space, Trails, and Riverfront Committee, offered the following recommendations. The applicant should provide a sidewalk along the church entranceway off Van Patten Drive from the Van Patten Trail to the front entrance of the church. The applicant should also provide a 10-foot wide multi-use path along Ushers and Pierce Roads and from the intersection of Ushers Road and VanPatten Drive to the property line on Pierce Road. This multi-use path would extend the existing Ushers Road multi-use path east of VanPatten Drive and provide an important trail segment in the Trails Master Plan’s community goal of a continuous trail loop connecting the Van Patten Trail, the Ushers Road Trail, Pierce Road, the Kinns Road Trail, and Carlton Road. Landscaping should be provided as a buffer between the trail and the church along Van Patten Drive, Ushers Road, and Pierce Road.

A parking lot centerwalk should be provided through the middle of the parking lot to the front entrance of the church for safe pedestrian access. A bicycle rack should be installed for bicycle parking.

Mr. Jim Ruhl, 168 Wood Dale Drive, speaking as a representative for a neighborhood association formed in 2004 to thwart the development application submitted by Exxon-Mobil for this parcel, reinforced recommendations mentioned previously, stating that he supported the request for the applicant to complete a Full Environmental Assessment Form. The speaker, observing the significant parking area proposed, spoke against the “denuding of the site,” and the negative impacts of increased traffic on Ushers Road, focusing particularly on the truck traffic from Pierce Road and the Fairchild complex. Mr. Ruhl recommended that the Board consider requesting the installation of a “round-a-bout” in proximity of Pierce Road, Ushers Road, and VanPatten Drive. He encouraged the construction of trail links that would connect existing trails to the proposed parking lot and, perhaps the development of a small park area that would create a “friendly neighborhood” amenity for those living and working in the area.

Mr. Vincent Puruolo, 28 Terrace Court, recommended that the traffic study conducted for this application include traffic counts on weekdays as well as Sundays since church activities will likely take place throughout the week.

Mr. Ophardt commented that when he reviewed the site plan he was struck by the “field of parking” and he questioned whether or not all of the 559 spaces proposed were necessary. Mr. Buell explained that, per town code requirements, the 1,000 seat church would require 500 parking spaces. Additional spaces are provided for future growth. The church currently has one Saturday service at 6:30p.m. and two services on Sunday morning at 9:30a.m. and 11:00a.m. Approximately 500 people attend each service. Mr. Buell reported that Creighton-Manning was preparing a traffic study that would include estimated traffic generation counts for all times during the week. He stated that the applicant would certainly be willing to consider “landbanking” extra spaces until such time as their use is warranted. Mr. Ferraro called for a “strategically integrated landscaping design,” recommending that the design consultant consider such amenities as the installation of treed islands within the parking area as well as a walkway with a treed canopy through the parking lot to the church’s front entranceway. Mr. Koval agreed that a center walkway would be important and recommended that the northeasterly corner of the proposed parking area be “shaved down” to provide more greenspace: preservation of existing vegetation would be preferred. Mr. Andarawis agreed that the parking area should not be the most prominent design feature. Pastor Cremeans commented that he found the idea of a park for residents and those working in this area attractive. In response to Mr. Ophardt’s question regarding a possible location for such a park, Mr. Buell explained that since such a concept was first introduced at this meeting, no possible location has been considered. Mr. Ophardt stated his support of the Trails Committee recommendations for a sidewalk to VanPatten Drive and a 10’ wide trail along Pierce Road. Mr. Ferraro focused on the facility’s traffic impacts as a major issue to be addressed and asked that the study analyze impacts on weekdays when events will take place for “churchgoers” as well as those attending community events. Mr. Ferraro asked that the applicant provide clarification regarding the answer to item #15 of the Environmental Assessment Form which indicates that there may be endangered species or habitat within close proximity of the parcel. Mr. Lansing agreed to “follow up” on this question. When questioned about the building’s possible architectural design, the

consultant explained that the building committee was reviewing a number of possible options. Ms. Bagramian recommended that any signage for the site be “unobtrusive and tasteful.” Mr. Ferraro ended the discussion by stating that the mitigations of traffic impacts were of utmost importance to Board members.

Mr. Koval moved, seconded by Mr. Prescott, adjournment of the meeting at 9:50p.m. The motion was unanimously carried. The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on June 28, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,

Janis Dean, Secretary