

Town of Clifton Park

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

PLANNING BOARD

ROCCO FERRARO
Chairman

ANTHONY MORELLI
Attorney

MEG SPRINGLI
Secretary



MEMBERS

Emad Andarawis
Denise Bagramian
Jeffery Jones
Andy Neubauer
Eric Ophardt
Greg Szczesny

(alternate) Teresa La Salle

Planning Board Minutes

March 21, 2017

Those present at the March 21, 2017 Planning Board Meeting were:

Planning Board: R. Ferraro, Chairman, E. Ophardt, D. Bagramian, E. Andarawis, A. Neubauer, G. Szczesny, J. Jones
T. LaSalle – Alternate Member

Those also present were: J. Scavo, Director of Planning
A. Morelli, Counsel
M. Springli, Secretary

Mr. Ophardt, Vice Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:03pm. All in attendance stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Minutes Approval

Mr. Szczesny moved, seconded by Mr. Jones, to approve the minutes of the meeting on March 7, 2017 as written. Ayes: LaSalle, Andarawis, Neubauer, Szczesny, Jones, Ophardt, Bagramian
Noes: None. Motion approved.

Public Hearings None

Chairman Ferraro arrived at 7:06pm and continued with the proceedings.

Old Business

2017-002 Ravenswood Outdoor Patio - Site Plan

Applicant proposes to construct an outdoor patio area along with a new bathroom and new door out of the existing enclosed seating area, 1021 Rt 146, Zoned: B-3, Status: PB Preliminary Review

Tom Andress, Consultant, with ABD Engineers, presented the project, an application to add an outdoor patio area and restroom to an existing restaurant in a B-3 zoning district. Mr. Andress noted that parking had been modified, handicapped spaces were relocated and signage for additional parking would be added. Next Mr. Andress stated that the modifications had eliminated the need for the applicant to seek an area variance.

Mr. Ferraro asked for clarification of about the section of the Code that would allow for interpretation of required parking spaces and Mr. Scavo noted that this application was an instance where the Planning Board would have the ability to waive the requirement based on Section 208-99(B)(2). It was noted that the existing shared parking arrangement with the adjacent property would address the additional spaces needed.

Staff Comments:

Building and Development

Steve Myers issued a memo dated 2/28/2017 with the following comment(s):

- Variance required for extension of parking spaces closer to property.
- Do not believe 25' will provide enough maneuvering distance for vehicles in parking spaces. Bollards will further restrict this 11'O.C. will not protect wall.
- What "code" is being used to say parking aisle is compliant?
- Are parking spaces south of building to be eliminated?

Planning Director

John Scavo offered the following:

- Prior to pouring the concrete ramp, it is highly recommend the contractor contact the design engineer to ensure the slope elevation does not exceed the proposed 1:12.
- All my prior comments have been adequately addressed.
- The Saratoga County Planning Board stated there would be no significant County Wide or Inter Community Impact.

Professional Comments:

Joel Bianchi, MJ Engineering issued a letter on 3/10/2017 with the following comment(s):

- The plans show an additional 3-feet of asphalt paving along the western property line that is intended to provide room for parking and the adjacent 25-foot access way. While the existing parking at this location is within the setbacks of the side yard (and may be considered a pre-existing nonconformity), it is believed that the non-conformity cannot be made worse without first seeking an area variance from Section 208-38 (D) of the Town's Zoning. We would defer to the Town's Chief Zoning Officer on this matter.
- The proposed bike rack is shown to the rear of the building. Consider relocating it to a more conspicuous location, if possible.
- Correct the accessible parking signage detail to show a minimum of 60-inches between the ground surface and underside of the mounted sign.

Public Comment:

No comment

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Neubauer asked if the bollards were in addition to the masonry wall that had been shown on the prior plan. Mr. Andress explained that the bollards and reconfigured parallel parking spaces along the patio area were modified to improve traffic flow. Discussion ensued regarding the parking space needs considering the added seating at the patio and calculations determined that the agreement with the adjacent neighbor was more than adequate. Board members asked that the masonry wall be decorative and subject to building permit approval.

Mr. Ophardt moved, seconded by Ms. Bagramian, to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, an unlisted action, and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA. The motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Jones moved, seconded by Mr. Szczesny, to waive the final hearing for this application for the site plan review of Ravenswood Outdoor Patio, 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 listened in the final comment letter issued by the Planning Department. Ayes: all. Noes: none. The motion was unanimously carried.

2017-003 Camp Bow Wow – Site Plan

Applicant proposes converting the existing Giffy's BBQ site to Camp Bow Wow, a day care facility for Boarding Dogs. A 3,235 Sq Ft addition will be added to the rear of the existing building and outdoor enclosed play areas will be constructed in the existing parking lot.

Overnight boarding, grooming and training will also be provided, 1739 Rt 9, Zoned: B-4A, Status: PB Prelim Review - Poss. Determination SBL: 272.1-2-13.1

Mr. Neubauer recused himself from this item to avoid a conflict of interest, and left the room. Mr. Ferraro stated that Ms. LaSalle would be a voting member for this project in the absence of Mr. Neubauer.

Tom Andress, Consultant, with ABD Engineers, presented the project, a proposed canine daycare facility in a B-4A zoning district. Mr. Andress described that the plans included some reduction of pavement and the building of an addition at the rear of the building. The consultant also stated that a 20' wide easement for a future sidewalk had been added to the plan that would allow for some maneuvering around obstacles that might be encountered within that easement. Mr. Andress stated that the outdoor area was separated into 4 small solid vinyl fenced enclosures and that dogs were going to be attended at all times when outside and none would be outside after 7:00pm. Mr. Andress next stated that topography would naturally limit the movement of any of dogs off this property to adjoining properties.

Matthew Beck and his wife Marlene, the applicants were also present. Mr. Beck addressed concerns that had been expressed by neighbors at an earlier meeting and through written comments submitted to the Planning Board:

- Odors would be controlled by using “power loos” in the building to flush dog waste to the sewer system rather than in the dumpster
- HD Cameras would be used throughout the facility to ensure that cleanliness and safety

protocols required by the Franchise are strictly followed

- Dogs will not be walked outdoors by employees of the facility
- Customers might walk their dog to relieve them when going to or from the car but the space for that will be limited
- This would not be a veterinarian facility
- Felt noise was controlled because dogs are socialized inside and barking is kept to a minimum because of behavior modification and counselor training
- Employees will be trained to move any barking dogs inside
- Dogs will be screened for appropriate behavior, and will be excluded if they do not display appropriate behavior in a group setting

Staff Comments:

Environmental Conservation Commission

The ECC held a meeting on March 7, 2017 to discuss the project and issued a comment letter stating that:

- The ECC notes the concerns of the adjacent businesses including medical practices regarding the potential for noise and noxious odors. The applicant shall demonstrate that their design will address these issues. The patient population (ie. Pregnant women) served by the medical facility have hypersensitivity to these environmental impacts.

Building and Development

Steve Myers issued a memo dated 2/28/2017 with the following comment(s):

- The aisle width along the proposed addition does not meet the 26' requirement but it is a short enough area to be allowed.
- No further comments at this time.

Planning

John Scavo offered the following:

- Add a note to the plan which states, "Any utility work or construction within the State Highway Right-Of-Way requires the property owner to obtain a highway work permit from the NYS Department of Transportation, whether it is for construction or installation of facilities, or for repairs and maintenance."
- Saratoga County Planning Board noted that there was no significant County Wide or Inter Community Impact.

Professional Comment:

Joel Bianchi, MJ Engineering issued a letter on 3/10/2017 with the following comment(s):

- Correct the accessible parking signage detail to show a minimum of 60-inches between the ground surface and underside of the mounted sign.
- The abandonment of the existing grease trap is noted. It is suggested that (1) the material to fill the grease traps be noted, (2) connecting sanitary pipes be disconnected and (3) holes be punched in the bottom so they don't become filled with water. This may also require input from the Saratoga County Sewer District as the end recipient of sewage waste from the parcel.

Emails had been received and were provided to the members of the Planning Board.

Public Comment:

Michael Klimkewicz, resident of Clifton Park, and owner of 4 and 6 Chelsea Place, stated that he and his wife had offices at this location and they had several tenants that have expressed concerns with:

- Noise
- Smell
- Traffic turning and entering from Route 9
- Stormwater management on the parcel, fecal matter in the front might be added to their retention pond
- Tenants may not choose to renew leases with the proposed business as a neighbor

Deborah Clothier, owner of Spa at Chelsea Park, 4 Chelsea Place stated that her parking area was directly behind this property and was concerned that her clients could see right down into the dog area and that even if the dogs could not see clients through the fencing, they would bark because they heard cars arriving. Ms. Clothier also stated that her clients also expected quiet for their massage, facials, acupuncture and hypnosis treatments, and she felt that if the environment changed, it would impact her business.

Mr. Beck stated that there could be up to 70 dogs in the facility. Mr. Beck commented that the employee would be equipped to train dogs to stop barking and/or remove them from the outside area. The speaker also noted that this was an allowed use for this property per Town Code.

Mr. Ferraro questioned the applicant about their policy about cleaning up the exterior dog waste, and Mr. Beck stated that bags would be provided on premises for that purpose, and that employees would also be monitoring the site and cleaning up the exterior daily.

Mr. Beck also explained that dogs under 10 pounds would not be accepted. Then he stated that the screening process would include an extensive interview and screening with a gradual introduction of the dog to other dogs to see what temperament and behavior was to be expected and that the dogs would be matched in groups to encourage the best behavior of all the pets.

Mr. Jones asked about sound abatement or baffling and Mr. Beck noted that the interior space would have insulation and wood to absorb sounds. Next Mr. Beck explained that the perimeter of the space would have no windows and there would be flaps on the dog doors leading to the outdoor area. A solid 8' tall vinyl fence would minimize sound traveling and visibility. Mr. Beck noted that dogs would be playing and socializing all day long and that by 7:00pm if they were staying overnight, that the pets would be put into "cabins". Then the applicant stated that the dogs would not be able to see the other pets and he felt they would not be antagonizing each other.

Traffic was also discussed and it was noted that trip generation would be less intense than the prior approved use of a restaurant. A neighbor expressed concern that the trip calculations did not consider that Giffy's Barbeque had been closed and traffic patterns would not reflect the conflicts that arose from having the two opposing properties (Giffy's and Peddler's) both operating. Andrew Mangini, representative of Giffy's noted that Giffy's was open during the time period that Peddlers was open, and therefore disputed that concern.

Peter Belmonte, owner of 743 Route 9 and 9 Chelsea Park stated that his questions were technical. He asked about the location of the sewer connection. He also asked about the storm management area, and requested that the capacity of the retention area would not be impacted since there is still one more site that could be developed at Chelsea Place. Mr. Andress stated that this would not impact that area. Mr. Klimkiewicz asked if the Hoffman building was included in the calculations for the stormwater drainage. Mr. Andress responded that they were not using the capacity in the adjacent basins because they used drywells.

Mr. Ferraro stated that the drywell systems would be designed to act as a ground filter for any of the stormwater flow before it would indirectly reach the basins and that if the owners were picking up solid waste, the liquid waste should not be a problem in the stormwater retention areas.

Kate Falco, representing owners of the adjacent property located at 1741 Route 9, the Masherjians, and their tenants, stated that they opposed the project and noted the following concerns:

- Reactive remedies for noise abatement (sending dogs inside after they bark)
- Vinyl fencing would not prohibit barking
- Businesses operating there would be impacted by barking
- Questioned tenants' longterm willingness to remain
- Traffic issues and turning

The Chairman asked if there were any other issues or concerns from the public, and there were none.

Planning Board Discussion

Members expressed that they understood neighbors' concerns for noise and cleanliness and felt that the applicants had adequately addressed those issues. Outdoor landscaping and buffers were discussed and the applicant stated they would add additional trees in existing gaps along the northern and eastern boundary . It was asked if other facilities such as PetSmart and the problems with pet waste in the parking lot had been examined, but board members felt that was not truly comparable due to the lack of green space at the entrance at this location. It was noted that noise in this area already existed from traffic, restaurants, and delivery trucks and that the applicant had plans in place to mitigate the issues that noise ordinances in Town Code would be enforceable if noise levels exceeded allowable limits. Mr. Jones also added his opinion that any other business allowed in this zone, such as a restaurant, would be likely to have more impact to the traffic than this particular use.

Mr. Jones moved, seconded by Ms. Bagramian, to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, an unlisted action, and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA. The motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Szczesny moved, seconded by Mr. Ophardt, to waive the final hearing for this application for the site plan review of Camp Bow Wow, and to grant preliminary and final site plan approval conditioned upon adding trees in existing gaps to the northern and eastern vegetative buffers and satisfaction of all comments provided by the Planning Department, Town Designated Engineer, and all items listened in the final comment letter issued by the Planning Department. Ayes: All. Noes: None. The motion was unanimously carried.

New Business

2017-010 Rucinski 2 Family Home – Special Use Permit (SUP)

Applicant proposes to build a 2 family home in an R-1 zone, 528 Grooms Rd, Zoned: R-1,

Status: PB Concept Review

SBL: 277.-3-94.2

Fred Metzger, Consultant, representing the applicant, Mr. Rucinski, presented the project, a special use permit for a 2-family residence in a R-1 zoning district. Mr. Metzger explained that after meeting with the Chief Zoning Officer regarding the 50' setback line for a keyhole lot, the consultant was able to adjust the building envelope so a variance would not be needed. Mr. Scavo explained that the Planning Board would have the ability to place conditions on the Special Use Permit to allow for a duplex, an in-law use, or to make the original 2006 subdivision plan stand.

Staff Comments:

Environmental Conservation Commission

The ECC held a meeting on March 7, 2017 to discuss the project and issued a comment letter stating that:

- The ECC recommends that the applicant install split rail fencing and/or signage to delineate the existing ACOE wetlands on the project site.

Building and Development

Steve Myers issued a memo dated 2/28/2017 with the following comment(s):

- No documents-no zoning issues believed to exist.

Planning Department

John Scavo offered the following:

- Project referred to SCPB
- Project appears to meet 50' setback for keyhole lot
- Standard notes be included on plan
- Subdivision previously approved in 2006 as a keyhole lot

Planning Board Discussion

The chairman noted that he felt there was a big difference between the term in-law apartment and duplex, even though the Town Code does not distinguish between the two. Mr. Ferraro also noted that he had serious reservations and would like to maintain the original single family residence plan. Board members also expressed concern with the architectural elevation. The difference between an in-law apartment being restricted for use by a family member versus a possible rental unit was also discussed. Mr. Scavo explained that the Planning Board, in past practice, had allowed special use permits to include the condition that if the in-law apartment would no longer be used by a family member, the kitchen would be removed and the property would be reverted back to use as a single family residence.

Board members appeared not to be in favor of making an exception by allowing a two-family residence on a keyhole lot, but Mr. Scavo advised the consultant and the Board that the applicant would have the right to ask to appear before the Board for preliminary review if they so choose and that no vote would be taken at this meeting.

Public Comment: None

2017-009 Clifton Park Center Road Apartments

Applicant proposes construction of a residential community with access from Clifton Park Center Road and Wall Street. A total of 38 units to be included in 4 buildings on 3.98 +/- acres. Each unit will have its own garage and one additional parking space. An elevated walkway will provide connectivity through the property over the wetland. Provisions for stormwater management will be made on-site. Connections to municipal water and sewer will be made, Clifton Park Center Rd, Zoned: TC2, Status: PB Concept Review
SBL: 271.-3-76.1

Joe Dannible, Consultant, with Environmental Design Partnership, representing Clifton Park Holding Co., presented the project, an apartment complex with 38 units in a TC2 zoning district. Mr. Dannible indicated that one building would be accessed from Wall Street and three would be accessed from Clifton Park Center Road. The northern 12-unit building would be accessible to the other units by way of a sidewalk. Traffic generation trips were discussed and said to be statistically insignificant, and no change in the level of service would be noted. The DEC wetlands were mapped in the corridor and it was stated that the wetlands no longer met the criteria for DEC wetlands and were going to be removed from DEC jurisdiction. It was further stated that the wetlands would be marked as ACOE wetlands and a letter of determination had been received. Next, Mr. Dannible showed an image of the building elevations and possible materials and the consultant explained that it would be subject to review by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), as stated in the Town Center Code.

Mr. Ferraro remarked that two Planning Board members, in addition to himself, would be asked to serve on the TAC for this project, if it moved forward.

Staff Comments:

Environmental Conservation Commission

The ECC held a meeting on March 7, 2017 to discuss the project and issued a comment letter stating that:

- The ECC requests the applicant obtain a wetland jurisdiction designation (i.e. NYSDEC or ACOE).
- When the project moves forward the ECC would like to see further detail of the construction of the proposed boardwalk and how the construction will be limited in the wetlands.
- The ECC notes that the project will result in intrusion into the LC Zone. The applicant must file for an Application for Approval of Work To Be Done in the LC Zone with the Town of Clifton Park

Building and Development

Steve Myers issued a memo dated 2/28/2017 with the following comment(s):

- Zoned TC-2.
- Property appears to be significantly covered by ACOE and NYSDEC wetlands and buffers.
- Stormwater management areas proposed in wetlands.
- Zoning compliance table not included therefore compliance review not possible.

- Access roads shown as 24' must be a minimum of 26' per NYS Fire Code.
- Stormwater drainage from the Bentley not shown and could have significant influence on this site. Also, drainage from pond at Clifton Park Center discharge via this corridor and again will influence design. Boardwalk in wetland may not be practical.
- Proximity of entrance from Wall St. to existing parking entrance is too close.
- Further comments expected with more detail.

Stormwater Management Technician, Scott Reese offered the following comments on 3/9/2017:

- With the close proximity to the stream and wetlands, test holes for seasonal high ground water will be required.
- The stormwater management area to the north should be setback from the building per the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual.
- Additional detail of the boardwalk crossing the wetlands and stream will be required when the project advances in the design process.
- Deed references of the drainage easements shall be added to the plans.
- Next submittal shall show how the drainage of the 8 unit building along Clifton Park Center Road will drain to the Stormwater Management Area in the back.
- How will the drainage be handled from the roofs of the apartments? Will there be a gutter system or will it sheet flow off the roof?

Planning Department

John Scavo stated that a letter from Jen Viggiani, Open Space Co-ordinator, was sent to the applicant and can be discussed in detail with the TAC.

Professional Comment:

Joel Bianchi, MJ Engineering issued a letter with the following comment(s):

General Comments

- The submitted SEQRA Full Environmental Assessment Form indicates the total project disturbance will be more than one acre and therefore would be subject to the NYSDEC Stormwater Regulations and GP-0-15-002. As the project advances through the Town's regulatory review, a SWPPP addressing water quality and quantity controls shall be provided.
- The project proposes to provide potable water to the buildings. The applicant shall provide the Town documentation indicating the Clifton Park Water Authority's (CPWA) ability and willingness to provide 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 buildings from the Town of Clifton Park, by way of the Saratoga County Sewer District No. 1 (SCSD). The applicant shall provide the Town documentation indicating both the Town's and SCSD's ability and willingness to provide sewer capacity to the project. Any approvals offered by the Planning Board should be conditioned on receipt of SCSD's review and approval.
- Given the size of the proposed development, at a minimum, the applicant shall provide a summary of expected peak hour vehicle trips. Should this analysis show that more than 100 new peak vehicle trips will result, a formal traffic impact statement may be required. This assessment needs to account for other projects

proposed within proximity of the site.

State Environmental Quality Review

- Based upon our 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 is not necessarily limited to the following:
 - Clifton Park Water Authority: Taking of additional water.
 - Clifton Park Sewer District: Additional reserve sewer capacity.
 - Saratoga County Sewer District: Additional reserve sewer capacity.
 - New York State Department of Environmental Conservation: permit coverage under GP-0-15-002.
 - New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation: determination of the absence of existence of cultural, historic or archeological resources within the project site.
 - United States Army Corps of Engineers–potential joint permit application for disturbances to regulated wetlands.
 - Additional involved/interested agencies may be defined as the project proceeds through the Town’s regulatory review.

Full Environmental Assessment Form

- Under Part B, list all agencies having jurisdiction.
- Under Part D.2.b the response provided is “no”. The site contains extensive wetlands. Subsequent submission shall describe how these wetlands will be protected and preserved to support the response provided.
- Under Part D.2.c.ii, additional information must be furnished to substantiate the response that the existing water district is capable of servicing the project (see also Comment 2).
- Under Part D.2.d.iii, additional information must be furnished to substantiate the response that the existing sewer district is capable of servicing the project (see also Comment 3).
- Under Part 2.D.j, additional information must be furnished to substantiate the response that the project will not result in substantial increase in traffic above present levels (see also comment 4).
- Under Part E.2.1, the response notes the project is located over the Schenectady – Niskayuna Sole Source Aquifer. As the project design advances, special attention must be paid to vertical boundary conditions that must be applied when development the project specific stormwater facilities.
- Under Part E.3.f the response indicates that site or portions of the site is located in or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archeological resources. In order to demonstrate eligibility for covered under General Permit GP-0-15-002, consultation with the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation is required

Site Plans

- The project is located within the Town’s TC2 Edge Zone of the Form Based Code (FBC). A separate review of the project with respect to the TC2Zone bulk lot requirements has been completed and included as an attachment to this review Based upon the initial review of this applicant with respect to compliance with the FBC, it is suggested that the applicant meet with the TAC, independently to review the site plan and discuss modifications required.
- The proposed buildings are subject to the Architectural Standards outlined in

Chapter 6 of the Form Based Code. No proposed building elevations have been furnished to complete an architectural review.

- The site contains substantial wetlands which may or may not be impacted as a result of the planned improvements. Placement of the proposed stormwater facilities will need to be closely examined considering what may be a shallow groundwater table.
- It is recommended that pedestrian facilities be provided along Clifton Park Center Road that connects to the internal portions of the site.
- There should be consideration of providing cross lot easements to the adjacent parcels to provide a greater level of access management.
- The applicant shall coordinate with the responding fire department for the location of the Knox Box and fire department connection. Notation to that effect shall be added to the plans.
- Indicate whether or not the proposed buildings will be equipped with automatic sprinklers. This will dictate whether on-site fire hydrants are necessary.
- Should on-site hydrants be warranted, the site access roads shall comply with Appendix D, Section 103 of the Fire Code of New York State (FCNYS).
- Indicate the proposed maximum building height in the event appropriate aerial fire access is required in accordance with Appendix D, Section 105 of the FCNYS.22.Subsequent submissions shall include information as outlined in Section 208-115 of the Town zoning specific to lighting, site grading, landscaping, erosion control and stormwater management to fully assess the design and its compliance to the applicable standards.

Public Comment:

Anthony LaFleche, 21 Wheeler Drive, resident and member of Trails Subcommittee asked what the setback from Clifton Park Center Road was and the consultant explained the TC2 zone was 10' and that a sidewalk was planned in the front.

Planning Board Review:

Board members asked if the boardwalk was intended for public use. Peter Murray noted that there were other potential pathways to be considered for a public connection to the YMCA and that it would be something to discuss with the TAC. Density in the Town Center and building layout and landscaping of the site were also discussed, as well as the potential for some outdoor resident amenities. Board members stated that they felt the boardwalk should cross over the stormwater retention area if possible. Mr. Neubauer expressed support for this project in the Town Center and felt that this design was appropriate in this location as a connector parcel between the residential and the commercial zones. Mr. Neubauer stated that he thought the configuration might need some reconfiguring. Then, Mr. Neubauer also stated that he felt that the connectivity should be expected to be used by the public as that was part of the entire concept of a Town Center, and that the path along Clifton Park Center Road should be a multi-purpose path not a sidewalk. Mr. Jones also expressed support for the project in general but he questioned the public connectivity so near the apartments.

Mr. Ferraro stated at this point he felt the applicant had enough feedback to take into consideration and that they should plan to meet next with the Technical Advisory Committee. Mr. Szczesny and Mr. Neubauer, along with Mr. Ferraro, volunteered to participate as Planning Board

representatives to the TAC.

Discussion Items – none

Mr. Ophardt moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to adjourn the meeting at 10:13 pm. The motion was unanimously carried. The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on March 28, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret L. Springli
Secretary

Cc: Planning Board members, Planning Department, Supervisor, Assessor, Zoning Board, Department of Building and Development, Town Clerk, Town Board Members, Highway Superintendent, Town Attorneys, ECC, CPWA