

03/11/25

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

PLANNING BOARD

DENISE BAGRAMIAN
Chairwoman

VIDA SHEEHAN
Attorney

PAULA COOPER
Secretary



MEMBERS
Emad Andarawis
Eric Ophardt
Heather Fariello
Mario Fantini
Keith Martin
Lisa Westrick
Matthew Luke (alt.)

Planning Board Minutes
March 11, 2025

Those present at the March 11, 2025 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board: D. Bagramian, Chairwoman, E. Andarawis, H. Fariello, E. Ophardt,
K. Martin, L. Westrick, M. Luke (alternate)

Those absent were: M. Fantini

Those also present were: J. Scavo, Director of Planning
W. Lippmann, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C.
V. Sheehan, Counsel
P. Cooper, Secretary

Ms. Bagramian, Chairwoman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. All in attendance stood for recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Presentation by Friends of Open Space (30 Minutes)

Minutes Approval:

None

03/11/25

Public Hearings:

None

Old Business:

#2023-016 1019 Route 146 Gas Station and Convenience Store Site Plan

SBL: 271.-1-11 Proposed construction of gas station and convenience store, 1019 Rt 146

Zoned: B3 - Neighborhood Business, Status: Final Applicant: M & M Food Mart

Consultant: Nolan Engineering, PLLC – R. Nolan Last Seen On: 01/14/2025

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Kevin Pultorak stated they were last here in January and the application at that time was presented with 2 curb cuts. He stated that one was onto Route 146 and the other was to a side access road. He stated that they were here in December for final approval but the easement agreement for the side access fell through. Mr. Pultorak stated, that if the Town takes over the now private road then the applicant would still like to connect in the future. Mr. Pultorak stated this was presented to the ZBA as well and they liked the new design and the area variance requested was decreased. He stated that the variance was not granted by the ZBA until they received a written advisory opinion from the Planning Board with its thoughts on the single access provided to the site from Route 146. Mr. Pultorak stated that the underground storage has also been moved away from the Dwaas Kill and there is now parking in its previous location

Staff Comments:

The Environmental Conservation Commission and issued a memo recommending:

- In order to minimize erosion from the underground stormwater management area, the ECC recommends that the outfall be tied into the existing stormwater structure along NY Rt 146. This will provide for a single outfall into the Dwaas Kill, instead of the steep embankment.
- The ECC recommends that the applicant include an easement for a pedestrian sidewalk that would connect with the existing sidewalk at the traffic circle and any potential sidewalk installed by the Park West development.

John DeSimone, Fire Marshall issued a memo:

- Assigned Postal number to remain, 1019 Route 146

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter had the following comments:

03/11/25

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

1. No further comments at this time.

SITE PLAN

2. It is noted that the applicant has submitted an application to the ZBA for various variances. The applicant was on the ZBA agenda for the March 4, 2025 meeting. The applicant should indicate on the cover sheet the variances granted by the ZBA.
3. The applicant has indicated that the consultant will confirm the high-water mark of the Dwass Kill and depict it on the plans.
4. The flared end section detail on Sheet SMP-1 should be revised to reflect the proposed 12" HDPE pipe instead on 48" CMP
5. The underground detention area detail indicates the 6-inch outlet invert to be 91.23 which differs from the stormwater analysis of 304.75, revise accordingly.
6. On Sheet SMP-1 confirm the size of the outlet pipe. It mentioned the size is to be restricted to 6" however the plan is showing 12".
7. Provide the overall dimensions of the underground storage area.
8. Show the extension of rip rap at the proposed end section coming from the underground detention area.
9. On Sheet ESC-1 inlet protection shall also be provided for the proposed catch basin structures.
10. It should be noted on the plans that any work within the NYS Route 146 right of way will require a permit from NYSDOT.
11. The plan set is subject to the review and approval of the NYSDOT as part of the highway work permit. The final plans shall incorporate any technical comments issued by the NYSDOT.
12. Provide stockpile detail.
13. Provide the required dimensions and depth of the concrete washout area per NYSDEC Standards for Erosion and Sediment Control shown on Sheet ESC-1. Another detail for a concrete washout is provided on Sheet D-100 that's meets the NYSDEC Standards. The detail on Sheet ESC-1 should be deleted.
14. Update the Sign #2 detail with the correct language on the No Parking sign to say "No Parking Any Time" pursuant to Section 1111.5 of the Building Code of New York State.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REPORT

15. Section 1.0(B) indicates a Stormtech infiltration system, this should be revised to reflect the plans as a detention system.

TRAFFIC

16. No further comments.

Public Comments:

No public comment.

Planning Board Review:

Ms. Bagramian asked if the exit would have a right turn only lane. Mr. Pultorak stated they can look into a right turn-only lane with a wider access and put it on the plan but they would need to

03/11/25

look at it first to see if it would work. Mr. Martin stated this was previously discussed so vehicles exiting right are not impeded by left existing vehicles.

Mr. Andarawis stated that a single point of access makes sense than a double curb cut on Route 146. Mr. Andarawis asked how this would affect the fuel trucks. Mr. Pultorak stated there is an analysis for the emergency and fueling trucks that was submitted 12/16/24 and the turning template works.

Mr. Andarawis asked if the applicant would commit to connecting to the side road when it becomes public. Mr. Scavo stated that the Board needs to look at the application in real-time and cannot mandate future connections per case law.

Mr. Martin asked if civil engineers looked at the curb cut. Mr. Pultorak stated that traffic engineers looked at it as well as the plan and stated that site lines should remain the same.

Ms. Bagramian stated she is fine with the one curb cut as long as there is a dedicated right turn lane for exiting the site.

All Planning Board members had a positive recommendation for the ZBA and are in favor of the dedicated right turn lane.

Old Business:

#2024-042 492 Clifton Park Center Rd Two Family Dwelling SUP

SBL: 271.-3-87 Request for a special use permit for a two family dwelling., 492 Clifton Park Center RD Zoned: R1 - Residential, Status: Final Applicant: Boni Builders, Consultant: GVG Land Surveyor, PLLC – K. Weed Last Seen On: 02/11/2025

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Pat Jarosz stated he is here tonight for final approval for a duplex. He stated that the only remaining issue was the site distance. Mr. Jarosz went through what was done from the last meeting and stated that the driveway would be raised 3'. He noted sight distances by stating, to the west side distance was found to be 516' and over 1,000' to the east. Mr. Jarosz stated this exceeds the requirements for a road with a posted speed limit at 40mph.

Staff Comments:

John DeSimone, Fire Marshall issued a memo:

- See approved postal verification for assigned postal numbers

Scott Reese, Zoning Administrator issued a memo stating:

03/11/25

- This Special Use is permitted per Town Code 208-10 B. (10)(a)[7] identifies a Dwelling, two-family and/or semidetached as a special use pursuant to chapter 208-79. The proposed land area exceeds the minimum area requirement.

Professional Comments:

No professional comments.

Public Comments:

No public comment.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Martin stated that he stands by what he said at the last meeting, he is behind the project but needed to see the site lines done by a professional. Mr. Martin asked if Mr. Jarosz was present for the site distance analysis that was done. Mr. Jarosz stated that he was not but noted Mr. Kevin Weed a professional licensed surveyor was. Mr. Martin asked if there was an engineer present. Mr. Jarosz stated he was unsure; however Mr. Weed is a licensed surveyor that works with Towns in this area frequently. Mr. Martin stated he still had concerns about an individual who was not an engineer completing the analysis and he requested it at the last meeting. Mr. Jarosz stated the analysis meets AASHTO (The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials) guidelines for conducting a sight distance analysis.

Ms. Bagramian stated she believes Mr. Weed follows standards and asked Ms. Westrick if he had any thoughts on the application, as she has a background in traffic mitigation. Ms. Westrick stated she went out to the site and stated the applicant meets the standards and conforms to Code, but she does have site reservations just like Mr. Martin. Mr. Jarosz stated that Mr. Weed did have the equipment to raise the instruments to the driveway height for more accurate measurements. Ms. Westrick stated that she is comfortable with Mr. Weed's comments and her own observations on the site visit.

Mr. Andarawis asked if the Board could make a condition for the driveway to be elevated the 3' Mr. Weed ensures the height from for sight distance.

Mr. Ophardt stated the applicant needs to ensure the elevations are correct to ensure the proper height of the driveway access. Mr. Jarosz stated that the driveway may be higher if the applicant decides to pave it. Mr. Scavo stated that surveyors will be out to the site so they can ensure it is accurate and the plans will not be stamped until elevations can be verified and added to the final plan

Mr. Ophardt offered Resolution #5 of 2025, second by Ms. Westrick, to waive the final hearing this application and to grant preliminary and final approval of the special use permit, conditioned

03/11/25

upon satisfaction of the comments offered by the Planning Board, Planning Department, and Town Designated Engineer, including submitting the landscaping plan for approval to the Planning Department prior to the stamping of the Special Use Permit.

Conditions:

1. Achieving the necessary height for the driveway for site distance per the traffic site distance analysis at 12 feet back from the edge of roadway.
2. Side load garage is provided for one of the dwellings.
3. Fencing and easement provided for the historic cemetery were installed and honored by the property owner.

Roll Call:

L. Westrick – Yes
H. Fariello – Yes
E. Andarawis – Yes
D. Bagramian – Yes
E. Ophardt – Yes
K. Martin – Yes
M. Fantini - Absent

The motion is carried.

Mr. Andarawis moved, second by Ms. Westrick, to waive the final hearing for this application for the site plan review of 492 Clifton Park Center Road to construct a Two Family Dwelling, and to grant preliminary and final site plan approval conditioned upon satisfaction of all comments provided by the Planning Department, Town Designated Engineer, and all items listed in the final comment letter issued by the Planning Department.

Conditions:

1. Achieving the necessary height for the driveway for site distance per the traffic site distance analysis at 12 feet back from the edge of roadway.
2. Side load garage is provided for one of the dwelling units.
3. Fencing and easement provided for the historic cemetery installed and honored by the property owner.

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0

The motion is carried.

New Business:

#2025-006 670/674 Plank Road Two Family Dwelling SUP

SBL: 271.8-5-26, 271.8-5-25 Request for special use permits for a two family dwelling, 670 Plank RD , Zoned: R1 - Residential, Status: Concept Applicant: T. Place & T. Broeck, Consultant: GVG Land Surveyor, PLLC – K. Weed

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Pat Jarosz stated he is here tonight for an application to construct two, two-family dwellings on Plank Road, each on a previously subdivided lot. He stated there would be a lot line adjustment, and it has been applied for.

Staff Comments:

John DeSimone, Fire Marshall issued a memo:

- postal numbers that plan shows are correct and current. No need for additional or change regarding postal verification.

Scott Reese, Zoning Administrator issued a memo stating:

- This Special Use is permitted per Town Code 208-10 B. (10)(a)[7] identifies a Dwelling, two-family and/or semidetached as a special use pursuant to chapter 208-79. The lot line adjustment for the two lots will need to be approved by the Town and filed with Saratoga County prior to Planning Board approval of the SUP.
- As an application for a Special Use Permit the submitted package should provide the proper information to meet Town Code Chapter 208-79 D (1) - (6). The plans should show the location of the two proposed duplex's, the grading and utility connections to show the increase of development will not impact wetlands, easements, or other properties.
- This Special Use is permitted per Town Code 208-10 B. (10)(a)[7] identifies a Dwelling, two-family and/or semidetached as a special use pursuant to chapter 208-79. The proposed land area meets and/or exceeds the minimum area requirement.

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo stating:

- All modifications to the Maxwell Road Subdivision including this SUP will need to be coordinated in updating the current SWPPP for this subdivision.

Jennifer Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator issued a memo stating:

- This project site is on the west side of Maxwell Drive, which has an existing multi-use trail on the east side of Maxwell. This SUP proposal for two (2) duplexes for 4 units total, should consider adding a path along its frontage along Plank Road, connecting to Via da Vinci and Maxwell Dr. and adding neighborhood connectivity. The 2012 Trails Concept Plan: A LongTerm Vision, Town of Clifton Park identifies Plank Road for a potential multi-use trail route. The addition of a path segment from Via Da Vinci to Maxwell Drive, along Plank Road, would provide a significant public benefit to the community for closing a neighborhood gap to the Maxwell Drive Multi-Use Trail, which leads to a

03/11/25

diverse, commercial area, restaurants, and shopping, among many other community destinations.

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a memo stating:

- The applicant should address if the 2-family dwelling changes the stormwater management, preservation of disturbance limits from the subdivision previously approved by the Planning Board
- Provide evidence that the Clifton Park Water Authority and Saratoga Col. Sewer District each have capacity and willingness to serve the additional density of a 2 family dwelling
- The Special Use Permit Application appears to be an Unlisted Action pursuant to SEQRA. The only involved agency appears to be the Clifton Park Planning Board.
- Provide JD on wetlands based on new permit.
- Provide a plan showing the orientation of the proposed 2-family dwellings and driveway locations.
- Provide roadway visual impact visuals with building elevations and landscaping.
- Provide Maxwell Drive sight distance.

Professional Comments:

No professional comments.

Public Comments:

No public comments.

Planning Board Review:

Ms. Bagramian asked what the size of the homes would be. Mr. Jarosz stated he does not know this early in the application process.

Mr. Ophardt asked what the access would be for the 2 lots. Mr. Jarosz stated one of the lots would come out on Maxwell Drive and the other onto Plank Road. Mr. Jarosz passed out a site map with the proposed curb cuts in the meeting and stated this can be uploaded to the file in the morning.

Ms. Bagramian stated she would like the placement of the homes on the map as well.

Mr. Andarawis stated that the lots had originally come from a subdivision and he feels it is constrained on the corner due to traffic so the architecture and placement are important. Mr. Jarosz stated there are wetlands to the west and it challenges the placement of the homes. He stated that there is a gravel drive currently so the Board can do a site visit if they choose to look at it.

Mr. Ophardt asked what the wetland jurisdiction was here. Mr. Jarosz stated it is ACOE. Mr. Lipmann stated that the applicant needs to submit paperwork to verify jurisdiction because this may change the zoning if DEC takes jurisdiction under the new state wetland regulations.

03/11/25

Mr. Andarawis stated the garages shown look like front loads and the Board typically likes to see one side load. However, he can see why this was done due to wetlands. He asked the applicant to look into what they can do to change this into one side load. He stated he would also like visuals of the renderings from the road front.

Ms. Bagramian stated she wants landscaping added to the plan to see visuals with privacy.

Ms. Fariello stated that the driveway onto Maxwell Drive seems to be on wetlands and asked the applicant to address this with the next submittal.

New Business:

#2025-008 Starpoint Church Parking Expansion Site Plan

SBL: 277.16-2-21 Starpoint Church parking Expansion, 14 Jarose PL , Zoned: R1 - Residential, Status: Preliminary Applicant: Starpoint Church, Consultant: ABD Engineers – J. Hitchcock, Jr

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

John Hitchcock stated he is here tonight for Starpoint Church. He stated that a majority of the Board has seen these property one or 2 times and there was also an expansion of the church about 5 years ago. He stated the last parking expansion was done about 2 years ago and now they are asking for more due to patrons parking on the road. Mr. Hitchcock stated that they plan to demolish the home on the property and there would be no access to Grooms Road from the church. Mr. Hitchcock stated the proposal is to add 69 more parking spaces to the lot and stormwater will be handled with porous pavement which will be able to hold a 100 year storm. He stated that they have looked at comments and concerns with the existing basins and brought it to attention about 2 years ago. He stated he went out the other day after the rain and ice melt and the basin is dry. Mr. Hitchcock stated that snow would be handled on-site and would be kept away from the neighbor with wing edges. Mr. Hitchcock stated the existing landscaping will be saved and moved along Grooms Road with red cedars to the east and they would add more spruce trees. He stated that the entire southwest part of the parcel is wetlands that were delineated in 2021 so no construction can be done there.

Staff Comments:

The Environmental Conservation Commission and issued a memo recommending:

- 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 ECC recommends that project utilize mature and native trees at a minimum of 6 feet in height along the western border of the

property in order to provide mature screening for the residence. The ECC recommends that the Planning Board require the applicant to provide a 15-foot vegetative buffer between the western edge of the parking area and the existing residence. Additional plantings should be added along the eastern portion of the new parking area to provide screening for the existing residents on the east side of Jarose Place.

- The ECC requests the Zoning Administrator verify the side yard setback for parking spaces.
- The ECC requests the applicant to provide a light plan with a future submission. The lighting plan should be in compliance with International Dark Sky Standards.
- The ECC notes under Town Code section 208-79 G. (3) Modifications and additions to special uses; Subject to the foregoing any amendment or modification will be limited to a 25% expansion of the improved area subject to the special use. The ECC Notes that the proposed parking increase of 69 spaces is approximately a 33% increase of the permitted special use. This is in addition to the previously approved parking expansion.
- The ECC is concerned with the impact of the additional parking on existing traffic circulation at the intersection of Jarose Place and Grooms Road.

Wade Schoenborn, Building and Zoning issued a memo stating:

John DeSimone, Fire Marshall issued a memo:

- Existing postal number will apply for this project. No additional postal numbers required.

Scott Reese, Zoning Administrator issued a memo stating:

- This application is for a second addition to a Special Use Permit (SUP). The two proposed parking area expansions are an approximate 35% expansion from the original SUP. Per Town Code Chapter 208-79 G. (3) any amendment or modification will be limited to a twenty-five-percent (25%) expansion of the improved area subject to the special use. Therefore an area variance will be needed. The ZBA would like a written advisory decision for the total expanded parking from the original approved SUP.
- Per Town Code Chapter 208-79 E. (1) (h) the Planning Board shall determine whether the proposed special use will satisfy that the proposed site provides adequate parking facilities to protect against hazardous traffic and/or parking conditions is met.

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo stating:

- No further comments other than supporting MJ Engineering's comment letter dated March 7, 2025, regarding the Stormwater related comments.

The Trails and Open Space Subcommittee issued a memo stating:

Jennifer Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator issued a memo stating:

- Kindly request the applicant consider an alternative layout, for planning board evaluation, that considers alternative utilization of their full 6.37-acre parcel to the south of the church buildings and sheds, where there is lawn and woods. Is there an alternative layout that could be considered that "T's" up a third entrance along Jarose Place across from Arthur Court intersection to allow for overflow parking? This would take pressure off removing/demolishing an existing home on the applicant's parcel, and leaving that for affordable housing, and also for maintaining the scenic, rural residential character along Grooms Road. While it would not be ideal to remove trees in the southern portion of the

parcel, one could envision a modest route and parking off the new driveway, ideally retaining a similar woodland character as the Town's new Town Center Park entrance off of Maxwell Drive.

- The 2012 Trail Concept Plan: A Long-Term Vision, Town of Clifton Park identifies Grooms Road as a location proposed for multi-use paths, to continue to close in gaps along this Grooms Road Corridor. The frontage along Grooms Road owned by the applicant should consider a future multi-use trail along this corridor for the future.

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a memo stating:

- Please inform the Board if the applicant plans additional outdoor lighting is proposed.
- Three letters of concerns from residents have been received and provided to the Planning Board. These letters were received on 3/11, 3/10 and 3/3. Common issues discussed include traffic, traffic concerns regarding emergency services access, speeding on Grooms Road from South Barney intersection to Exit 8A,. Questions include proximity of parking to adjacent property lines front and side, will the hill be graded down for the parking lot, and will the lot remain vacant during the week and devalue adjacent residential lots.
- I recommend including an image showing the entire parcel even if reduced on the stie plan. Has the applicant evaluated other locations onsite for additional parking and if so discuss how the preferred location was determined by the applicant.
- The proposed project is subject to Section 239 of General Municipal Law and will be referred to the Saratoga Co. Planning Board for a recommendation.
- Measure sight distance for snow storage and views from ingress and egress points.
- Add notes for snow storage operations and plowing.
- PB Members desire a public hearing at the Preliminary Plan Submittal review, separate from the ZBA Area Variance Hearing.
- County Planning Board Referral is required.
- Evaluate fence for neighboring property to the West. Final orientation & location of the fence will be a condition of approval from the Planning Board (Residential Character for Fencing).

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter had the following comments:

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

1. Based upon our review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an “Unlisted” action. In Town Code Section 208.95(F)(9): Subject to and in accordance with the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), the Planning Board shall be the lead agency for the purpose of conducting the environmental review of the application for a Site Plan. The Planning Board shall conduct an integrated comprehensive environmental review of the proposed project in combination with its review of the application under this article. If 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 is not necessarily limited to the following:
 - a. Town of Clifton Park Planning Board: Plan approval

03/11/25

- b. Saratoga County Planning: GML 239-m County Referral
- c. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation: Stormwater Discharge and Notice of Intent

Additional agencies may be identified by the Town during its review of the project. The applicant has submitted Part 1 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF).

Based upon our review of the submitted Part 1 SEAF, the following comments are offered:

- 2. Part 1 13.a. – The response indicates that wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by federal, state or local agencies adjoin or are contained within the project site (per the EAF Summary Report). The applicant should provide documentation that confirms the presence or absence of federally or state regulated wetlands adjacent to the project site. Should this change as the project design progresses, additional approvals and permits may be required.

SITE PLAN

- 3. The project resides within the Town's Residential, R-1 Zoning District. The proposal for exterior parking lot improvements may be considered ancillary to the existing principal use.
- 4. Since there are no planned building renovations and/or changes in use proposed, a review of the building placement, building form, building type and allowed frontage types as outlined in the R1 Zone have not been completed.
- 5. Based upon a review of Section 208-11 of the Town's Zoning, the lot and proposed uses appear to meet the minimum bulk lot requirements.
- 6. Show the existing home on the property to the north to better understand the location of the expansion relative to the home.
- 7. On the grading plan it appears that there are two 296 contours on the south side of the expanded parking lot, this should be revised accordingly
- 8. Provide the invert of the proposed underdrain into the catch basin.
- 9. For the new porous pavement areas, infiltration tests should be performed in these locations to validate any design assumptions made.
- 10. A note should be added to the plans indicating heavy equipment shall be restricted from area before, during and after construction.
- 11. Contributing area to porous pavements shall not exceed 3 times the surface area of the porous system, please confirm calculation.
- 12. Show the location of any underdrain discharging to daylight.
- 13. The previous Phase 2 concept back in 2022 showed a subsurface stormwater management system which may be better suited for the site. Due to the documented ponding water on site and capacity of the northwest stormwater management area the applicant should consider these conditions into the stormwater design.
- 14. Show where snow storage will occur on site.
- 15. Provide numerical footcandle values to ensure no light spillage is going onto the neighboring property to the west as it will be adjacent to the house.
- 16. Considering the plan submitted is conceptual in nature, we 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 specific to site grading,

03/11/25

lighting, landscaping, erosion control and stormwater management to fully assess the design and its compliance to the applicable standards.

STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN/MANAGEMENT REPORT

17. The SWPPP shall also look at the existing northwest stormwater basin capacity as the water elevations appear to be higher than originally anticipated in the design.

Public Comments:

No public comment.

Planning Board Review:

Ms. Fariello asked where the snow would be stored as it would be to the east but there would be a concern with site distance and the landscaping buffers. Mr. Hitchcock stated he feels the trees are far enough back that it shouldn't interfere, and they can stay closer to the south, away from the entry.

Ms. Bagramian stated she has the same concerns as 2 years ago and asked if they would now be at max build-out or if they would be back again. Mr. Hitchcock stated they are now at max with this proposal due to the wetlands to the rear of the site.

Ms. Bagramian stated that if one service is causing traffic, can other things be done to mitigate this as she feels this is a lot of pavement for this location. Mr. Hitchcock stated services have been added but it is still not satisfying the parking, and there are about 60 cars on the road when the traffic study was done, and they want to fix the parking on the roadway. Pastor Roscoe Lilly stated he was last here in 2022 for parking, and he had asked for this then and had decided with Mr. Scavo that they would wait to see if the additional parking was needed. He stated that they also livestream the weekend services, and they added 2 more in-person services. He stated that their intent is to make the roadways safer. Pastor Lilly stated that the last approval had it conditioned that the home would not be rented or sold and they have followed that. He stated that they have 35-55 extra cars they need to make room for and some of the cars are also in non-designated parking areas on their property. He stated they have people directing traffic and helping with parking now but if left alone, it may become unsafe.

Mr. Ophardt asked if there were 4 services on Sunday. Pastor Lilly stated there is one on Thursday and three on Sunday. Mr. Ophardt stated that adding more parking spaces would only encourage more parishiners to attend the current three services on Sunday. Mr. Ophardt was concerned that without additional services being offered on Sundays, we would only find ourselves in the same parking situation two or three years from now. Pastor Lilly stated they are exploring adding a 5th services.

Ms. Bagramian stated that another way to mitigate the 2 services needs to be found as it was supposed to be mitigated before.

03/11/25

Mr. Martin stated that a resident from Jarosz Place wrote a letter. He stated that the resident had suggested that there be a shuttle from the park and ride, and he suggested I-87 Exit 8 & 9 Park and Rides be explored... Pastor Lilly stated that it could be used for larger holidays but he does not think it is a permanent fix for the problem.

Ms. Bagramian stated that at the last approval, the applicant was supposed to keep off the road.

Mr. Martin stated to be fair he would like the applicant to read the resident letter and look into alternate recommendations.

Ms. Bagramian stated that they would also have a public hearing that would then allow for verbal public comment. Pastor Lilly stated that there have been fewer letters for this application than the last. Ms. Bagramian stated a public hearing will be held as the neighbors still have a right to be heard.

Mr. Scavo read for the record Town Code 208-16c, providing for a public hearing at the time of preliminary site plan consideration at the Planning Board's discretion.

Ms. Fariello stated 3 years ago this applicant expanded the parking lot and got along for some time. If the applicant adds more, how much longer will it satisfy the demand until they are back again? Pastor Lilly stated one building has a max capacity of 390 and the other 273, so he feels that 269 is great for parking as some have also been parking on the grass.

Ms. Bagramian asked how the applicant plans to get the patrons off the road and keep them off. Ms. Bagramian asked if the Board was in agreement with holding a future Public Hearing. All in attendance agreed.

Mr. Andarawis stated that there has not been a count of cars between the services as some patrons are leaving and some are coming in for the next service. Pastor Lilly stated that they do not allow them to park on the street, and they have volunteers that help direct traffic and people into parking spots that are open.

Ms. Bagramian stated they needed a new plan for people parking on the road. Pastor Lilly stated that this is a last resort, and there are volunteers who are stopping them from parking on the road and asking them to move if they do.

Mr. Hitchcock stated that 15 spots will have to go before the ZBA for approval and they have a public hearing as well. He asked if the Planning Board needs one as well. Mr. Andarawis stated that the Boards do not look at the same thing so they do need both. Mr. Andarawis stated that other things can be looked at as well as other suggestions like stacking cars for those whom linger longer, not to replace the proposal but to decrease the ask of the proposal. Mr. Hitchcock stated that they are doing this already and this could potentially prohibit emergency access.

03/11/25

Mr. Scavo stated that the high occupancy is due to the standing room that is accounted for in the building.

Ms. Bagramian asked for the applicant to come back with a site distance analysis for the snow removal.

Mr. Ophardt stated the applicate currently stores snow between the trees along the outside edges of the parking lot. Mr. Hitchcock stated they do, but they are also trying to keep the snow away from the neighbor. Mr. Ophardt asked about the drainage inlet at the Northwest corner of the parking lot, and whether all of the surface water runoff would flow towards it. Mr. Hitchcock state it is feet away from the adjacent property line, but this is a secondary collection point in case the porous pavement fails. Mr. Ophardt noted that the drainage inlet and the edge of the parking lot are only 3 feet from Mr Lupien's property line. In addition, the new parking lot would extend northward beyond Mr. Lupien's current fence, and halfway down his driveway toward Grooms Road. Mr. Ophardt expressed his concern that headlights from vehicles in the parking lot would shine onto Mr. Lupien's property. Mr. Hitchcock stated there is a shed and the garage on the east side of the home. Mr. Ophardt stated he would like to see either the fence extended or a landscaped buffer added to the edge of pavement adjoining Mr. Lupien's property. Mr. Hitchcock state they also have concerns about the proximity of parking lot to Mr. Lupien's property.

Mr. Hitchcock asked for recommendations or advice for a ZBA referral. Mr. Scavo stated he can give them a draft of the minutes for reference. Mr. Andarawis stated they cannot advise the Zoning Board of Appeals and they need to go through their process. Mr. Andarawis stated he has a concern over the 33% expansion. He also suggested the applicant consider a trail connection along Grooms Road and allow an easement for this.

Ms. Fariello seconds Mr. Ophardt's concern of the separation of the parking and the adjacent home. Mr. Hitchcock stated he would update the plan before going to the ZBA based on feedback tonight.

Discussion Items:

None

Ms. Fariello moved, seconded by Mr. Ophardt, adjournment of the meeting at 9:57 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

03/11/25

The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on March 25, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Cooper

Paula Cooper, Secretary