

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

Michael Hale

Joel Koval

Eric Ophardt

Kim Paulsen

Tom Werner

(alternate) Eric Prescott

Planning Board Meeting
June 25, 2013

Those present at the June 25, 2013 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board: R. Ferraro, Chairman, M. Hale, J. Koval, E. Ophardt, K. Paulsen,
T. Werner
E. Prescott – Alternate Member

Those absent were: E. Andarawis

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. Prescott would be sitting as a full voting member of the Board in Mr. Andarawis's absence.

Mr. Ferraro offered two comments prior to introducing the evening's agenda. He first complimented Mr. Scavo for representing the Town of Clifton Park at the Planning and Zoning Workshop held at Hudson Valley Community College on June 20, 2013. Mr. Scavo collaborated on a presentation that focused on the "opportunities and challenges" of form based code development. Mr. Ferraro reported that he has contacted government representatives about proposed changes to postal delivery service that would replace curb side delivery with centrally located standardized boxes and state to them the importance of the Postal Service providing their input regarding the location of mailboxes to the Planning Board during the subdivision review process. He offered his assistance to work with Post Office officials to participate in discussions

regarding design requirements and their implications for project developers and planning professionals.

Minutes Approval:

Mr. Ophardt moved, seconded by Mr. Koval, approval of the minutes of the meeting of June 11, 2013 as written. Ayes: Ophardt, Prescott, Werner, Koval, Ferraro. Noes: None. Abstained: Hale, Paulsen.

Public Hearings:

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

Old Business:

[2012-030] **Crescent Woods** – Proposed (75) lot cluster subdivision, 1567 Crescent Road – Revised conceptual review. SBL: 283.-2-8

Mr. John Stevens, consultant for the applicant, presented this application that was last considered by the Board on October 10, 2012. Mr. Stevens introduced Mr. Michael Scott, property owner and applicant, who was in attendance at the meeting and who will retain ownership of a five-acre “open space” parcel located in the northeasterly portion of the site. The 41.26 acre parcel to be developed lies within the R1 zone on the northerly side of Crescent Road, approximately .5 miles west of Northway Exit 8. Pursuant to Section 179-32 – 39 of the Town Code, the applicant proposes the creation of a “cluster” subdivision that would contain seventy-five (75) lots. Mr. Stevens explained that in accordance with Town Code requirements which mandate that those applying for approval of a “clustered” subdivision provide the Planning Board with a conventional layout proposal as well as the “clustered” layout, he submitted both for review. Briefly stated, based on the number of conventional lots that could be subdivided and applying the calculations required to establish the viable number of “clustered” lots, the proposed cluster subdivision plan calls for the creation of (74) single-family residential lots in addition to the five acre parcel reserved by the owner.

Mr. Ferraro interrupted Mr. Stevens at this point, expressing his concerns regarding the conventional design plan presented for consideration. He noted that since it is the conventional plan that “lays the groundwork” for the number of permitted lots in the cluster design, he saw many design flaws that – if corrected – would likely reduce the number of buildable parcels. He cited the proposed “undesirable” double-frontage lots, impacts to wetland areas, and lack of “public benefits” as problematic and noted that, by implication, improvements to the conventional plan may decrease the number of buildable lots permitted within the cluster proposal. He explained that that “the bottom line” was that a cluster subdivision alternative must offset the increased density by providing significant public benefit(s).

Mr. Stevens continued his presentation, stating that a 60’ wide buffer has been provided to offer a “significant protection” for existing surrounding properties. He explained that trail

connections to adjoining parklands will be included in the subdivision plan as the “design progresses.” Addressing the issue of right-of-way width raised by M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C., Mr. Stevens stated that a 30’ wide right-of-way is provided with 10’ utility easements on each side, thereby creating a 50’ right-of-way area. He reported that the proposed residences will be served by the CPWA and connection to the Crescent Waste sewer system. Mr. Stevens explained that the project proposal generally meets the criteria for a cluster subdivision, noting that the site contains more than the minimal 20 acres of land required for such a proposal, that, by virtue of the proposed 60’ buffer, the new subdivision would be “independent of other neighborhoods,” adequate right-of-way has been provided, pathways and trails will be included in the plan, wetland impacts will be mitigated, and open space lands will be set aside and conveyed to a homeowners’ association. He further explained that mitigation for unavoidable wetland disturbance may include the creation of a wetland area that would include interpretive signage since the property lies adjacent to an elementary school. The speaker noted that lot sizes range from 11,000 SF to $\frac{3}{4}$ acre. Consistent with the decision rendered by the Fire Code Appeals Board, the subdivision plan now shows two entrances onto Crescent Road.

In response to Mr. Ferraro’s comment regarding the excessive number [more than 18] of homes on a cul-de-sac, Mr. Scavo presented the applicant and Board members with a sketch plan prepared in consultation with Ms. Reed, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention, which shows how the roadways could be redesigned to meet code requirements.

Mr. Scavo explained that the comments received from the Trails Subcommittee of the Open Space, Trails, and Riverfront Committee have been forwarded to all Board members.

Mr. Scavo reported that Ms. Sheryl Reed, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention, provided the following comment in a memo dated June 24, 2013. The proposed access roadway in the “Alternate 2” design has been determined by the Fire Code Appeals Board to be unacceptable. The applicant should reconfigure the proposed layout to accommodate emergency service vehicles with a town-approved roadway. Both proposed subdivision layouts do not meet Section 179-25 of the Code of the Town of Clifton Park which does not allow for more than 18 dwelling units on a single access point: Road “C” would need to connect towards the rear of the subdivision near Lots #43 and 44.

Mr. Scavo stated that Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, provided the following comments regarding this application. Pursuant to Section 179-25, the new roadway configuration does not resolve the two means of access for more than 18 dwelling units. The applicant’s proposed “Alternate 2” with just an emergency access road has been determined to be unacceptable. “Alternate 1” shows (74) lots with greatly reduced front setbacks: the proposed front setbacks are less than the rear setbacks. There is also a 60’ no-disturbance buffer where the new lots back up to existing properties resulting in the buffer being within approximately 3’ of the new homes: Mr. Myers finds this “very unrealistic.” Lot #46 is a keyhole lot which is not allowed. Several lots (i.e. those of 10,150 SF and 10,082 SF) are unrealistically small. The proposed roadway section meets the absolute minimum requirements of the NYS Fire Code which requires a minimum roadway width of 26’. There is a 10’ utility easement outside the

right-of-way which “puts utility work within 10’ of the houses.” Mr. Myers commented that this could create concerns for the house foundations if utility work was ever necessary. The proposed roadway width leaves no right-of-way for snow storage: since snow would be pushed onto private property, it would be likely that snow plowing damage would also occur on private property. In order for the roadway system to be considered viable for emergency access, it should connect to the other end of road “C” near Lots #38 and 39. Highway law Section 189 stated that the right-of-way should be at least 3 rods or 49.5 feet.

Mr. Scavo offered comments prepared by the Planning Department. Mr. Scavo stated that the project plan submitted did not adequately address 18 lots on a single point of access since the first intersection converges both roadways to the same “pinch point:” he referred to the sketch plan mentioned earlier as a design that may be used to resolve this problem. He noted that the conventional layout is deficient since it proposes two access points on Crescent Road that converge at the first intersection: this should be reworked. In order resolve the significant number of issues raised by the Planning Board and professional staff at this meeting, Mr. Scavo recommended that a workshop be scheduled to discuss desired design aspects that should be incorporated within the clustering option. Clarifying the issue of double-frontage lots discussed earlier in the evening, Mr. Scavo explained that Section 179-26(D) of the Town Code states the following:

Double frontage and reverse-frontage lots should be avoided except where essential to provide separation of residential development from arterial streets or other disadvantageous uses or to overcome specific disadvantages of topography and orientation.

Mr. Montague, Environmental Specialist, reported that the ECC offered the following recommendation regarding this application. To determine if any intrusion on wetlands is occurring, the types and limits of the LC zone and 100’ buffer zone, NYS DEC wetlands, and federally jurisdictional wetlands should be identified on the plot plan. Mr. Montague commented that it appeared that the applicant had adequately addressed the issues of concern.

Mr. Bill Malloy, 21 Weston Drive, questioned the ability of the applicant and/or developer to manage stormwater on site, explaining that run-off from the parcel currently impacts adjoining properties. He observed that one of the proposed roadways bisects a designated wetland area and questioned whether disturbance of the area was acceptable. The speaker stated that traffic congestion along Crescent Road, particularly during peak travel times, was significant and asked if Planning Board members had considered the impact of additional vehicles on existing traffic flow. Mr. Ferraro addressed Mr. Malloy’s concerns stating that current regulations require that all stormwater be managed on site: a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will be required. He noted that there may also be “issues with the high water table” that the applicant will be required to mitigate.

In response to Ms. Pat Malloy’s question regarding the public access to the proposed subdivision plans and other materials submitted for review, Mr. Scavo explained that those interested in reviewing the project file must complete a Freedom of Information request (FOIL) at the Town Clerk’s office. Upon receipt of the request, the Planning Department will forward

the project file to the Town Clerk's office for review. He explained that a new request must be made each time the applicant submits a revised plan.

Mr. Dan Hartnett, 32 Southbury Road, stated that those drivers attempting to turn left from the recently developed Bradford Point subdivision located on the southerly side of Crescent Road just east of the proposed development find it almost impossible to do so during peak travel times and he asked if it was not likely that potential homeowners residing in the Crescent Woods development would find such a driving maneuver equally as difficult. Mr. Ferraro stated that he views traffic congestion along the Crescent Road corridor as a "significant issue" to be addressed.

Ms. Pat Malloy asked about the use of dedicated parkland areas and the 60' buffer area. Mr. Ferraro offered clarification, stating that although there would likely be a trail link to Pico Road installed through the parkland area located at the westerly side of the site, there would be no roadway connection or emergency access located there. He explained that the regulations for a cluster subdivision call for the establishment of a 60' buffer between existing parcels and the proposed development unless the proposed development consists of single-family homes.

Mr. Koval stated that although he favors houses with minimal front yard setbacks, he believes that there "is no way for this applicant to achieve a 60' buffer area around the site" and maintain reasonable backyard areas for potential homeowners. Citing Mr. Myers' comments regarding the nearness of the proposed buffer area to proposed homes, he described the width of the buffer as "excessive" and stated that homeowners would likely cut trees to increase their backyard spaces. Mr. Hale commented that "refinement of the plan" was necessary and suggested that "give-and-take" between town officials and the applicant would be required to produce the "best development plan." He supported the dual entrance design and recommended that the applicant consider the construction of a small "traffic circle" to provide adequate vehicular access to various portions of the subdivision, though he cautioned that the roadway design was dependent upon approval by the Emergency Services Advisory Board (ESAB). The roadway must be "user and aesthetically friendly." Mr. Koval commented that although the Board always "looks for connectivity between subdivisions," the previously-designed and developed subdivisions that surround this property make roadway connections impossible: he supports the development of trail connections to adjoining neighborhoods where possible. Mr. Ophardt stated his support of Mr. Hale's traffic circle recommendation. He questioned whether or not the installation of utility lines through the parkland area that connects to Pico Road was feasible since it was his understanding that uses other than those associated with parklands require "alienation of parkland" approvable by the New York State Legislature. Mr. Pelagalli stated that he could not provide definitive comment on the question since he was not certain if the proposed utility connections would "disturb the existing function" of the property. He also noted that since the area was included in a specific park district, it was likely that Town Board action or approval by those residents of the district affected by the proposal would be required. Mr. Ferraro commented that there were a number of issues to be considered and he supported Mr. Scavo's recommendation that the Board appoint three of its members to attend a workshop with the applicant, staff members, and the town engineer to address the issues of concern. Board members agreed that plan revisions were necessary in order to meet the code requirement for

cluster legislation and to design an acceptable subdivision plan. Mr. Hale, Mr. Werner, and Mr. Ophardt agreed to represent the Planning Board at such a meeting.

New Business:

[2013-016] **Sportsmen's Club of Clifton Park** – Proposed 32' x 24' storage shed, 644 Englemore Road – Preliminary site plan review and possible determination. SBL: 283.-1-7

Mr. Dick Buehler, club representative, presented this application that calls for the construction of a 32' x 24' storage shed on the grounds of the property owned by the Sportsmen's Club of Clifton Park. The property is located on the southerly side of Englemore Road, approximately one-half mile east of its intersection with Vischer Ferry Road and lies within the R1 (Agricultural/Residential) zoning district. Mr. Buehler explained that the proposed shed will be located 357' from the property line and that it will not be visible from Englemore Road.

Mr. Scavo reported that Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, provided the following comments on this application in a memo dated June 20, 2013. Mr. Myers notes that representatives of his department have been discussing the construction of this building with club members for some time: the applicant's representative and consultant are aware of the requirements needed for the issuance of a Building Permit. Mr. Myers stated that no Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will be required.

Mr. Scavo offered the following comments prepared by the Planning Department. Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, will verify setbacks prior to the issuance of a Building Permit which is imminent, dependent only upon Planning Board approval. The final site plan submitted for stamping by the Planning Department must have the appropriate setbacks shown on the plan. Mr. Scavo addressed the issue regarding the conservation easement area as mentioned in the comment letter issued by M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C., stating that the Town Assessor provided him with a copy of a Memorandum of Understanding Between the Clifton Park Fish and Game Club and the Town of Clifton Park that defines the designated land conservation area and confirms that the proposed addition will not violate the term conservation easement for the site. Addressing the comment provided by the Trails Subcommittee, Mr. Scavo reported that there is an additional 16' of right-of-way on either side of Englemore Road: the total right-of-way provided will be sufficient width for future roadway improvements or installation of a multi-use trail.

Mr. Montague, Environmental Specialist, reported that, after review of this application, the ECC issued the following recommendations. Due to the sensitive environments that exist nearby, the applicant should state the type of flooring for the proposed shed. If hazardous materials will be stored on this site, the applicant must submit a plan for approval addressing handling and storage and spill response to the Town of Clifton Park Environmental Specialist before such materials are stored. The ECC notes that there is a test pit included on the site plan, though there is no indication of the purpose of the test pit.

In response to the ECC's comments, Mr. Buehler stated that the shed, which will be constructed on an arctic slab, will be used to store clay targets, tools, and other sporting equipment: no chemicals will be stored within the building. He explained that the test pit was conducted at the request of Building Department personnel and the results were provided to the town as required. He reported that the site has adequate drainage for run-off: no Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will be required.

Mr. Bianchi explained that M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. reviewed the site plan and supporting materials presented for review and provided the following comments. Based upon review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an "Unlisted" action. Assuming the Planning Board is to request Lead Agency status under SEQRA, the need to undergo a coordinated review is optional. In reviewing of the scope of the proposed project, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. finds no other agencies that would be defined as interested and/or involved.

Mr. Bianchi specifically addressed site plan issues. The project resides within the Town's R-1 (Agricultural/Residential) zoning district. A review of Section 208-8(B) of the Town Zoning does not list the existing use as a permitted principal use and therefore, the engineering firm has deferred to Town staff members to determine if the proposal is compliance with zoning. Pursuant to Section 208-115 of the Town's Zoning Code, the following specific mapping requirements need to be shown on the submitted map:

- a. Section 208-115(1) - building setback lines;
- b. Section 208-115(2) – existing zoning boundary delineations
- c. Section 208-115(10) - contour lines at 2 foot intervals
- d. Section 208-115(16) – description of method of sewage disposal, if required.
- e. Section 208-115(17) – description of method of securing water, if required.
- f. Section 208-115(20) – parking, if required.

The existing mapping notes an existing conservation easement (Conservation Easement No. 2) with the proposed storage building located within its boundaries. There should be confirmation by the applicant that the proposed construction is permitted within the mapped and filed conservation easement. The map should note the linear dimensions of the proposed building to the property lines.

Board members found the project plan acceptable.

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

Ms. Paulsen moved, seconded by Mr. Ophardt, to grant preliminary and final site plan approval to this application conditioned upon satisfaction of the comments offered by the Planning Department, Town Engineer, and all items listed in the final comment letter issued by the Planning Department. The motion was unanimously carried.

[2013-017] **Menneto Powersports** – Proposed 9,000 SF addition to an existing retail building, 1757 Route 9 – Conceptual site plan review.

Mr. Joe Dannible, consultant for the applicant, presented this site plan application that calls for the construction of a 9,000 SF addition to an existing retail outlet for the Board's consideration. Menneto Powersports is located on a 3.16 acre parcel on the easterly side of Route 9 approximately one-half mile north of its intersection with Chelsea Place. The site lies within the B-4A zoning district. Mr. Dannible explained that the applicant will also be renovating the existing façade and canopy to match the proposed addition. It is the applicant's intention to remove the canopy at the front of the existing building and construct a windowed "tower" display area at the building's northern edge. Although Mr. Dannible believes that the number of required parking space is excessive for the use of the building, parking will be expanded to accommodate a total of (51) spaces: this number includes (7) "landbanked" spaces. The proposed site improvements will include outdoor display spaces, a service area, and merchandise loading and unloading areas. The applicant intends to utilize the existing well and septic system. Since the site improvements will disturb less than one acre of land, no Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will be required. A stormwater infiltration swale will be constructed to manage run-off from the proposed impervious areas. Mr. Dannible explained that Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, has determined that since the existing site does not meet current code requirements, approval of several variances by the Zoning Board of Appeals, including side yard setbacks and a reduction in the width of the landscaped buffer, will be necessary. The speaker noted that all proposed improvements will comply with current codes. Mr. Dannible presented a revised plan that addresses Ms. Reed's concerns about emergency access to all areas of the building. He explained that the addition would provide for indoor storage of new merchandise, equipment, and other items that are currently stored outdoors. The consultant presented a photograph of an existing fence and tree line along the northern property boundary which indicated that the area contained several mature oak trees and 13' to 18' of "dense vegetation" and sought Planning Board recommendations regarding the adequacy of the existing buffer and/or the need for additional plantings.

In response to Mr. Ferraro's question regarding proposed building materials and compatibility of the addition with the existing building design, Mr. Dannible explained that the addition will be seamlessly integrated with the existing building to create a "uniform appearance."

Mr. Scavo reported that Ms. Sheryl Reed, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention, provided the following comment in a memo dated June 24, 2013. The proposed layout is required to have fire apparatus access roads to within 150' of all portions of the building per Section 503.1 of the Fire Code of the State of New York: this is not provided on the northerly side of the proposed addition.

Mr. Scavo read the comments prepared by Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development. Mr. Myers states that emergency vehicles must have access to within 150' of all

points of the building: this proposal does not meet this requirement on the northerly side of the building. Mr. Myers commented that it appears that “the building needs a setback variance” since the current building does not meet setback requirements. Expansion of the existing building will “make a non-conforming use more non-conforming.”

Mr. Scavo offered comments prepared by the Planning Department. Pursuant to Section 169-13, connection to a public sewer is required. A detail for the infiltration swale should be provided. The applicant should clarify whether or not a trash receptacle is proposed for installation on the site. If so, a detail for a fenced enclosure with vinyl slats should be provided. Mr. Scavo recommended that because the area has sandy soils conducive to a porous pavement application as well as a “southern sunlight exposure,” the applicant consider utilizing pervious concrete or asphalt for the proposed walkway. Approximate locations of the existing well and septic field must be shown on the plan. Since the project lies within 500’ of the municipal boundary with the Town of Halfmoon, a notification of the application will be forwarded to that municipality in accordance with Section 239 of General Municipal Law. If any cargo/storage containers are to remain on site, the area designated for such storage must be indicated on the site plan.

Mr. Dannible explained that connection to the existing municipal sewer line that lies across Route 9 from the project site would likely be cost-prohibitive and he asked if the applicant could be granted a waiver that would permit him to continue to use an existing fully functional on-site septic system. Mr. Scavo stated that he would investigate whether or not there was an appeal process that would allow the applicant to seek approval for continued use of the existing utility.

Mr. Montague, Environmental Specialist, reported that the ECC offered no comment on this application.

Mr. Bianchi reported that M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. offered the following comments on this application. 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 is not necessarily limited to the following: Saratoga County Planning – 239m referral.

Mr. Bianchi explained that review of the Long Form Environmental Assessment Form provided with the application resulted in several comments. Under A.6 the response indicates that the project is substantially contiguous to or contains elements listed on the State or National Registry of Historic Places (including archeological sensitive areas). Further information would be required relative to this item to assess whether or not the project will result in any adverse environmental impacts. Under A.4.a the source of the reference data should be identified. Under B.22 the response is “TBD” for well capacity: this item will need to be finalized prior to a SEQRA determination. Under B.25 there may be a need to add the Town of Clifton Park Zoning Board of Appeals as there appears to be proposed improvements within the building setback line.

Mr. Bianchi offered the following comments on the site plan. The project resides within the Town's B4-A (Highway Business/Restricted Retail) zoning district. Pursuant to Section 208-50.2(B) of the Town Zoning, the proposed expansion is a permitted principal use within the zoning district. Section 208-50.3(C) of the Town Zoning Code requires a 30-foot side yard setback, which the submitted plan shows; however, it appears that a proposed canopy will be constructed within this side yard setback. As such, the applicant may have to apply for an area variance in order to construct the proposed canopy. The Director of Building and Development should determine if this is necessary. Section 208-50.5 of the Town Zoning Code requires that property margins at the sides shall be planted with trees and shrubs for a width of not less than 15 feet: the plans do not describe how this provision is being satisfied. 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. The parking lot calculations note that the plan is deficient by one space as required by the Town Zoning. This deficiency is minimal in nature and the Planning Board may wish to grant a waiver from the required parking as allowed under Section 208-124. If the Planning Board does grant a waiver, the appropriate notation shall be provided on subsequent plan submissions. The bulk lot table notes that the building height will not exceed 35 feet which is the maximum allowable by zoning. The height of the addition must be indicated on the plan so that a complete review of the fire access to the building may be undertaken. Section 503.1.1 of the Fire Code of New York State (FCNYS) requires that a fire apparatus road extend to within 150 feet (45 720 mm) of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building or facility. With the proposed building expansion, it appears as if the north facing portions of the building do not provide the appropriate access. The Building Department must determine if the proposed building construction and use will warrant automatic sprinklers as prescribed in the Building Code of New York State. The plans note that the proposed expansion will utilize the existing on-site septic system and well. Subsequent submissions shall provide supporting information that verifies that these existing systems are capable of accommodating the proposed site expansions. Subsequent submissions shall include information specific to site grading, landscaping, erosion control, and stormwater management to fully assess the design and its compliance with the applicable standards. The applicant notes that the total land disturbance will not exceed one acre. As noted, a grading plan must be submitted to substantiate the expected area of disturbance and to determine whether or not a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be needed. Elevations and materials of construction for the proposed building expansion should be submitted to the Planning Board for review.

Mr. Dan Hartnett, representative of the Trails Subcommittee of the Open Space, Trails, and Riverfront Committee, asked that the applicant provide a bike rack near the store's entryway, noting that the property is located along the NYS designated bike route on NYS Route 9. He asked that the rack's location, specifications, and installation requirements be clearly shown on the plan.

Mr. Hale commented that he found the applicant's request for approval of a reduction in the number of paved parking spaces acceptable since the building's use generated little customer traffic. Mr. Koval agreed, stating that he has visited the site on several occasions and there have been few vehicles parked in the lot. He pointed out that authorization for a reduced number of paved spaces is consistent with prior Planning Board approvals. Board members all appeared to agree that although the required number of parking spaces per code requirements must be available on the site, approval of a reduced number of paved parking spaces was reasonable. Though Mr. Ferraro expressed his concerns regarding the amount of outdoor storage that is evident in the rear of the site, Mr. Dannible stated that it was difficult to provide indoor storage for everything associated with the business due to the number of vehicles being serviced and the type of merchandise offered for sale. He did say that the new addition would provide significant storage area for new units, store fixtures, and equipment, thereby reducing the amount of inventory and other items stored outdoors. Mr. Ferraro was especially concerned with the trailers that appeared to be permanently stored on site and asked that storage be "organized in a reasonable way" and that locations of items be indicated on the site plan. Mr. Hale supported Mr. Ferraro's request, stating that the site plan should provide an "organizational plan" that included locations for the storage of various items in the outdoor areas. Following up on Mr. Scavo's recommendation that the applicant consider porous pavement for the proposed walkway, it was suggested that porous pavement also be considered for the expanded driveway and parking lot areas. In response to Mr. Dannible's question regarding buffering and existing vegetation, Board members agreed that although dead and diseased plantings could be removed and replaced, the existing tree line should be maintained to the greatest extent practicable.

Mr. Koval moved, seconded by Mr. Werner, adjournment of the meeting at 8:50p.m. The motion was unanimously carried. The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on July 9, 2013.

Respectfully submitted,

Janis L. Dean,
Secretary

cc: Planning Board Members, Planning Department, Supervisor, Assessor, Zoning Board, Department of Building and Development, Town Clerk, Town Board Members, Highway Superintendent, Lou Renzi, Town Attorney, Tom McCarthy, Town Attorney, Paul Pelagalli, Town Attorney, ECC, Clifton Park Water Authority