

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**  
**October 22, 2013**

Those present at the October 22, 2013 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board: R. Ferraro, Chairman, E. Andarawis, M. Hale, J. Koval, E. Ophardt,  
K. Paulsen  
E. Prescott – Alternate Member  
T. Werner arrived at the meeting at 7:35p.m.

Those absent were: None

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 since Mr. Werner would be arriving late to the meeting.

**Minutes Approval:**

Mr. Ophardt moved, seconded by Mr. Hale, approval of the minutes of the meeting of October 8, 2013 as written. Ayes: Ophardt, Andarawis, Prescott, Hale, Koval, Ferraro. Noes: None. Abstained: Paulsen

**Public Hearings:**

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

**Old Business:**

[2013-017] **Menneto Powersports** – Proposed 9,000 SF addition to an existing retail building, 1757 NYS Route 9 – Preliminary site plan review and possible addition. SBL: 272.1-2-5

Mr. Joe Dannible, consultant for the applicant, presented this application that was considered conceptually by the Board on June 25, 2013 and again for revised conceptual review at its August 13, 2013 meeting. Mr. Dannible explained that detailed preliminary plans and written responses to the issues identified by the Town Engineer have been submitted for the Board's review. A copy of correspondence received by the consultant from the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation stated that the agency reviewed the project plan "in accordance with the New York State Historic Preservation Act of 1980 (Section 14.09 of the New York Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation Law)" and determined that the "project will have no impact upon cultural resources in or eligible for inclusion in the State and National Register of Historic Places." Mr. Dannible reported that a well test to verify that there is sufficient capacity to serve the business expansion has not been completed on the property to date: he asked that any approval be conditioned upon satisfaction of this requirement. Information regarding site grading, landscaping, erosion control, and stormwater management has been included with the submission. A Stormwater Design Narrative for the addition prepared by the Environmental Design Partnership indicates that stormwater management has been provided on the site to ensure that the proposed project does not result in adverse impacts to downstream properties and drainage corridors. The narrative explains that the proposed addition to the existing structure will result in approximately 0.9 acres of soil disturbance which is less than the one acre threshold for NYSDEC stormwater management and GP-0-10-001 permit requirements. Proposed infiltration basins will "attenuate and infiltrate" the stormwater runoff from the new impervious areas on the site. Parking remains as proposed on the revised site plan: twenty-four (24) paved spaces and nine (9) "landbanked" spaces will provided on site. Minor revisions to the site plan will require the relocation of two (2) of the "landbanked" spaces. It is likely that they will be placed in close proximity to the designated "outdoor storage area." Addressing the comment issued by M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C., Mr. Dannible explained that wall-mounted lighting fixtures are proposed: cut sheets and details will be submitted with the final site plan.

In response to Mr. Ferraro's question regarding the types of materials used for building construction, Mr. Dannible explained that the addition will be "architecturally similar" to the existing building.

Mr. Scavo reported that comments issued by the Director of Building and Development and the Trails Subcommittee of the Open Space, Trails, and Riverfront Committee have been forwarded to all Board members.

Mr. Scavo reported that the ECC provided the following comments regarding this application. The applicant *shall* comply with the Town's Hazardous Materials Policy which can be obtained from the Environmental Specialist. The policy specifically relates to the proper storage and handling of petroleum, oil, and lubricants. 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 encourages the applicant to connect to the public water and sewer systems. The ECC encourages the applicant to utilize porous pavement to potentially decrease the requirement for infiltration basins and swales.

Mr. Scavo read comments issued by Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, in a memo dated October 10, 2013. Mr. Myers noted that the following variances were granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals on July 16, 2013: an 18' side yard building setback from the northern property boundary; a 12' side yard parking setback area variance from the southern property boundary; a 15' variance from the planted landscaped buffer along side property boundaries from the front of the building to the rear property line.

Mr. Scavo offered the following comments prepared by the Planning Department. A note must be placed on the plan which states the following:

The property will be required to connect to public sewer at such time as the existing septic system fails or requires a capacity modification or expansion.

A landscaping security deposit will be required prior to the issuance of a building permit. Mr. Scavo asked the applicant to clarify the proposed uses for the designated "outdoor storage area." Mr. Dannible explained that the applicant intends to move most of the new merchandise currently stored within the three trailers on site to the new addition. The "outdoor storage" will generally be used to provide space for the storage of trailers used to transport items brought to the facility for service. He also noted that, due to the substantial slope between Adirondack Dental and the Menneto site, the proposed storage area is not visible from Route 9.

Mr. Bianchi reported that, after review of the documents and site plan submitted for preliminary review, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P. C. provided the following comments and recommendations. As noted in Comment 2 of the August 5, 2013 review letter, two items remain to be addressed, specific to cultural resources (FEAF – Question A.6) and well capacity (FEAF – Question B.22). As noted in Comment 3 of the August 5, 2013 review, the plans show proposed stormwater management facilities (infiltration basins). Further, the utility plan shows a portion of the site's runoff being conveyed to the existing stormwater facility along Route 9. Subsequent submissions shall include a summary of the design of the facilities demonstrating that there is no noticeable increase in runoff from the site upon build-out to ensure there are no adverse impacts from the development. The site plan indicates 9 parking spaces will be banked, however, the physical plan shows only 7 spaces: the plans must indicate where the remaining two spaces will be located. The egress door (existing) on the northeast corner of the existing building must show an exterior landing since it appears that the existing asphalt will be removed as part of the building expansion. The dumpster shown on the site plan must also show the concrete apron as illustrated on the associated detail. The site plan must note whether or not there is any proposed surface treatment for the area delineated as "Outdoor Storage" such as crusher run or other stabilization material. The plan must indicate how roof drainage is collected and conveyed to the on-site stormwater facilities. The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan should provide a silt fence along the western edge of the existing leach field to prevent construction vehicles travelling over it. The applicant must modify Erosion Control Note 1.B indicating that the proposed stormwater facilities (infiltration practices) cannot be used for

temporary sediment basins: other temporary measures to accommodate site runoff during construction must be used. The plans do not indicate whether or not there will be any exterior freestanding or building mounted light fixtures. Should any new fixtures be proposed, their location(s) must be shown and an illumination plan must be submitted showing foot-candle values on the ground surface and property margins for review.

Mr. Dan Hartnett, representative of the Trails Subcommittee of the Open Space, Trails, and Riverfront Committee, asked that the bike rack that is shown on the plan to the rear of the building be moved to a more convenient and visible location in front of the business. Though Mr. Dannible explained that the bike rack was located to the rear of the building because the applicant believes that only employees would ride bicycles to the site, Mr. Ferraro supported the Trails Subcommittee's recommendation and asked that the rack be moved to a location closer to the business's front entranceway. Mr. Koval commented that it was unlikely that those patronizing this business would arrive on bicycles.

Mr. Ferraro "followed-up" Mr. Scavo's stated concern regarding the use of the proposed outdoor storage space with questions regarding the intended use of the space, explaining that it should be treated in an "aesthetically appealing" manner. He recommended that there be "some rationale" for the placement of items within the space that would provide a basis for possible future site plan enforcement by Building Department personnel. Mr. Dannible explained that the variety of equipment such as trailers and sports vehicles stored for short periods of time made it difficult to define appropriate storage spaces on site. Mr. Ferraro explained that the possible "reintroduction" of large storage containers on site was of concern. In response to Mr. Ophardt's question regarding the impact of the proposed storage space on the stormwater management plan, Mr. Dannible explained that the area "which consists of grass and sand" was "existing:" there would be no impact to proposed stormwater management. When asked if the applicant had considered the installation of fencing along the southern property boundary, Mr. Dannible explained that since the area is not visible from Route 9 and because there is no development on the adjoining property, no plan for fencing has been considered. Mr. Hale found the proposed use of the area acceptable. In response to Mr. Andarawis's question regarding screening of the area, Mr. Dannible stated that the existing 10' berm was located on applicant's property: no change to the grading is proposed. Mr. Andarawis suggested that if the outdoor storage area is to be reserved for "temporary" storage, it may be prudent to define the term "temporary." Though Board members seemed to agree that "temporary" storage should limit storage of items within the area to 30 days or less, Mr. Ferraro commented that his main concern was not the temporary storage of items associated with the service portion of the business, but rather the "gradual introduction of permanent things." Mr. Koval remarked that he "views the project proposal as an improvement to the site." Mr. Ferraro requested information regarding the treatment for the proposed stormwater basin that would be located adjacent to the addition: Mr. Dannible explained that area will be graded and seeded.

Mr. Ophardt moved, seconded by Mr. Andarawis, 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. Koval moved, seconded by Mr. Hale, to grant preliminary and final site plan approval to this application conditioned specifically upon the understanding that the area designated on the site plan as an “Outdoor Storage Area” is to be used only for temporary storage of items related to the on-site servicing of equipment and vehicles, satisfaction of all comments issued by the Planning Board, Planning Department, Town Engineer, and all items listed in the final comment letter issued by the Planning Department. The motion was unanimously carried.

**New Business:**

[2013-033] **Kilmer Funeral Home** – Proposed 3,000 SF funeral home, Arnold Drive and NYS Route 146 – Conceptual site plan review. SBL: 271.-1-2.111

Mr. Koval recused himself from any comment and/or vote on this application, explaining that he acting as the property owner’s real estate broker.

Mr. Gavin Vuillaume, consultant for the applicant, introduced Mr. Todd Kilmer and Mr. Kevin O’Brien, applicants. He then presented this application that calls for the construction of a 3,000 SF funeral home on a 1.12 acre parcel of land located within the B1 (Business-Non-Retail) zoning district. The site is situated on the northeasterly side of the Arnold Drive-NYS Route 146 intersection. The facility will be accessed via two curb cuts from Arnold Drive. Water and sewer utilities will be provided by connection to existing systems. 40 parking spaces will be installed. Stormwater will be managed on site. The site, described as “vacant and wooded” contains an existing entrance identification sign for the Woodland Hills subdivision: there will be no impact to the sign. Mr. Vuillaume explained that, because the parcel has frontage on both Arnold Drive and Route 146, site development is “severely restricted” by setback requirements. He noted that the proposed building has been moved to the front of the site to “give the building prominence.” Mr. Vuillaume stated that the site will maintain 50% greenspace. The proposed 2,400 SF funeral home will provide a single viewing room and 120 seats. Preparation of bodies will take place in the building’s basement. Access to the rear of the building will allow for discreet transport of caskets.

Mr. Scavo reported that the ECC offered the following comments on this application. The ECC believes the proposed development is too intense for this parcel and has numerous environmental impacts. Any plantings on the utility easement should be carefully screened to allow for shallow rooting trees only.

Mr. Scavo reported that Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, offered the following comments in a memo dated October 10, 2013. The proposed use is permissible in a B1 zoning district. Pursuant to Section 208-35 of the Town Code, the required building setback from the front property line is 70’. Since the plan places the facility only 41’ from Route 146, a variance will be required. The Code requires a setback of 130’ from the centerline of Route 146. Since the plan shows only 89’ available, a variance is needed. Based upon the proposed plan, several other variances would be required: a 43’ variance from the required 70’ setback from the front property line for parking; a 23’ variance for development within the side yard. Additional variances would be required for the reduced buffer area along the side yards. The applicant

must assure that 50% greenspace is provided on the parcel. Mr. Myers observes that even though the number of parking spaces appears to meet code requirements, it “is believed to be less than actually needed.” He questions whether or not the applicant has space for “overflow” parking and notes that Arnold Drive may have to be posted with ‘NO PARKING’ signs.

Mr. Scavo offered comments provided by the Planning Department. He recommended that the Board require the installation of “No Parking Anytime” signs along both sides of Arnold Drive in the vicinity of the proposed funeral home. While there are no ITE standards for funeral homes, he requested that the applicant provide an analysis of “how much and when trip generation is anticipated with the proposed use.” Factors considered in the analysis may include the size of the funeral home, seating capacity, use of the facility for multiple services, and the number of existing funeral homes within a ten-mile radius. Section 208-33(E) of the Town Code related to B1 zoning regulations requires that the hours of operation within the zone be limited to 7:00a.m. to 10:00p.m. If the use abuts an existing residence, no outside commercial activities (i.e. garbage pickup, etc.) shall take place between the hours of 10:00p.m. and 6:30a.m. Section 208-33(D) of the Code states that “architectural design of a rehabilitated or newly constructed building shall be consistent with the designs compatible for residential dwellings. The design shall take into consideration the existing neighborhood, the exterior facade in regard to building materials and color and other appurtenances such as rooflines, dormers, windows, chimneys, and other items that create a residential appearance. All exposed mechanical equipment and service and storage areas shall be screened from public view. The architectural design should give the appearance of compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood and shall try, to the maximum extent possible, to avoid unbroken lengths of walls and the appearance of huge massive structures within an area of residentially-sized buildings should be discouraged.” In accordance with this section of the code, the applicant should submit architectural renderings at the time of preliminary consideration. The Planning Board minutes from this meeting will be forwarded to the Zoning Board of Appeals in order for them to be considered during that Board’s deliberation and decision regarding the necessary variances. Mr. Scavo encouraged the applicants to “engage the public early in the process” so that concerns and potential impacts may be identified and, if necessary, mitigated.

Mr. Bianchi stated that, after review of the materials submitted for review, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. issued the following comments and recommendations. Based upon the concept plan, it appears that the total site disturbance will approach one acre. Should the project result in more than one acre of disturbance, it will be subject to the NYSDEC Phase II Stormwater Regulations: General Permit GP-0-10-001 and a fully conforming Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan addressing water quality and quantity controls shall be submitted as part of subsequent plan submissions. The project proposes to provide potable water to the building from the Clifton Park Water Authority (CPWA) via a service lateral to the property. The applicant shall provide the Town documentation indicating the CPWA’s ability and willingness to provide additional potable water to the project: any approvals issued by the Planning Board should be conditioned on receipt of such review and approval. The project proposes to provide sanitary sewer service to the building from the Saratoga County Sewer District No. 1 (SCSD). The applicant shall provide the Town documentation indicating the SCSD’s ability and willingness to provide additional sewer capacity to the project: any approvals offered by the Planning Board should be conditioned on receipt of such review and approval.

Given the wide variations with potential vehicle trips associated with uses at the facility, it is recommended that, at a minimum, the anticipated peak hour trip generation be provided. It may also be necessary for a traffic impact study to be completed to determine potential impacts on levels of service with the adjacent roadways. Based upon review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an "Unlisted" action. Assuming the Planning Board is to request Lead Agency status under SEQRA, the need to undergo a coordinated review is optional. Under a coordinated review, involved/interested agencies to be engaged may include, but are not necessarily limited to the following: Saratoga County Sewer District: additional reserve sewer capacity; Clifton Park Water Authority: taking of additional potable water; Saratoga County Planning: 239m referral due to the parcel being within 500 feet of NYS Route 146; NYS Dept of Environmental Conservation: if the project is subject to the NYSDEC Phase II Stormwater Regulations then permit coverage under stormwater SPDES and identification of threatened and endangered species; NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation: if the project is subject to the NYSDEC Phase II Stormwater Regulations then identification of cultural or historic resources. Additional involved/interested agencies may be defined as the project proceeds through the town's regulatory review process. The project resides within the Town's B-1 (Business Non-retail) zoning district. Review of Section 208-32(A)(6) of the Town Zoning Code indicates that a funeral home is a permitted principal use within the district. It appears that there are instances where the bulk lot requirements are not satisfying the minimum requirements set forth in Section 208-35 of the Code, some of which are noted on the plan. The lot deficiencies identified are as follows: Section 208-35(C) requires the minimum lot width to be 180-feet along NYS Route 146 and the concept plan shows only 150-foot (+/-). Since this is a corner lot with double frontage it may not be necessary to meet this bulk lot requirement. Section 208-35(D)(1) requires that no building or parking shall be located within the 70-foot front yard setback. The concept plan shows both a building overhang and parking within this setback along the western property line that fronts on Arnold Drive. Section 208-35(D)(2) requires that no building or parking shall be placed closer than 25-feet from the side or rear property lines. The concept plan shows parking within the minimum side and rear setback lines along the eastern and northern property lines, respectively. Section 208-35(D)(4) requires a 10-foot buffer area along the side and rear yards for the purpose of screening from adjoining properties. The concept plan does not provide any buffer along the eastern property line. Section 208-98 requires that no building or part of a building shall extend nearer than 130 feet to the center line of NYS Route 146. The concept plan shows the building at approximately 90-feet from the center line of NYS Route 146. Section 208-35(A) of the Town's zoning requires that no more than one curb cut shall be provided per lot unless the Planning Board finds that traffic safety will be improved with the additional curb cut. The plans show two curbs cuts along Arnold Drive. Elevations and materials of construction for the proposed building must be provided as part of subsequent submission to demonstrate that the principals outlined in Section 208-33(D) of the Town Code are being satisfied. For concept site plan submission, Section 208-114(B) of the Code requires topographic information at no more than 10-foot contour intervals: the plan as submitted does not provide this information. The project proposes the minimum number of parking spaces of 40 pursuant to Section 208-99(B) of the Code. However, the Town may amend the minimum requirements based upon local or unique conditions. Given the potential for a wide variation in use intensity, the Town Code may not reflect actual parking demands and some level of overflow parking may be warranted. Considering that a number of area variances would be required in order to accommodate parking for the minimum number of

vehicles, the Board may wish to discuss how overflow parking would be handled and potential impacts to the surrounding roadways and neighborhood would be mitigated. There must be a determination as to whether or not the proposed building construction and use will warrant automatic sprinklers as prescribed in the Building Code of New York State. This information is needed to determine if an on-site hydrant is required to satisfy the requirements of Section 508.8 of the FCNYS. Subsequent submissions shall include information as outlined in Section 208-115 of the zoning code specific to lighting, site grading, landscaping, erosion control, and stormwater management to fully assess the design and its compliance with applicable standards.

Mr. Hartnett, representative of the Trails Subcommittee of the Open Space, Trails, and Riverfront Committee, asked that the applicant provide a bike rack near the entranceway, that the applicant consider the installation of sidewalks along Route 146, and that the area containing the Woodland Hills sign be donated to the Town as parkland.

Mr. Scavo addressed Mr. Hartnett's comments, stating that several years ago the Planning Board instituted a policy that required developers to contribute a "voluntary contribution" to future roadway improvements and/or multi-use pathway installation along the Route 146 corridor. He reported that, to date, more than \$60,000.00 has been received or pledged for these purposes.

Mr. Hale stated his resolute support for approval of the required variances deemed necessary for this project to move forward by the Director of Building and Development, describing the B1 zoning requirements outlined in the Town Code as "outdated" and "ill-conceived." He believes that the location and orientation of the funeral home appear reasonable and that parking behind the building as proposed is acceptable. He did comment that there may be some issues with traffic safety, including access for emergency vehicles, protection for those departing the site as part of a procession, and accommodation for local traffic. Mr. Ophardt observed that, based upon his experience attending wakes and funerals and the size of the proposed viewing area, the limited number of parking spaces could "become an issue."

Board members and the applicants discussed various parking alternatives. Mr. O'Brien reported that the funeral home's director often encourages a change of venue for high profile services in order to ensure that sufficient parking is available. Valet parking, double parking, and use of adjoining properties are all viable options for increasing the number of available spaces. In response to questions regarding possible development on available land to the west of Arnold Drive, Mr. O'Brien explained that since that property lies within the B3 zone (in which retail uses are permitted), the cost of the 12 acre parcel is prohibitive. Mr. O'Brien explained that wakes are often conducted during "off-peak" travel times, reducing impacts to existing traffic patterns and that lighting is turned off by 9:00p.m., minimizing impacts to adjoining properties. When questioned by Mr. Werner about traffic flow through the site, Mr. Vuillaume stated that though the northern-most curb cut would be full-access, the southern-most one would be restricted to egress only.

In response to Mr. Ophardt's question concerning the amount of buffering existing to the rear of the site and the need for "shallow-rooted" plants over the utility easement, Mr. Vuillaume explained that there is existing vegetation on the site and that it will be preserved and enhanced

to the greatest extent practicable. Mr. Ferraro recommended that the applicant provide extensive buffering to the rear of the parcel and along Arnold Drive. Board members agreed that Zoning Board approval of the required variances would be necessary before the project is again presented for Planning Board review. They voiced support of Mr. Scavo's recommendation that residents in close proximity to the site be advised of the application "early in the process," perhaps utilizing the 500' notification process to inform neighbors of the application.

[2013-034] **Parkwood Plaza – 60 Minute Fitness** (Special Use Permit #80952) – Proposed commercial recreation facility, 1758 U S Route 9 – Preliminary review and possible determination and affirmation of existing Special Use Permit #80732. SBL: 272.1-1-7

Mr. Michael Barker, applicant, explained that he requests approval to operate a business titled 60 Minute Fitness in a vacant space available at the northern end of Parkwood Plaza. The business is "geared toward suspension fitness techniques using TRX apparatus." Mr. Barker explained that no modifications to the exterior of the building are proposed and that there will be no changes to the parking areas. The applicant intends to utilize 1,200 SF of space for the installation of 18-21 fitness "stations." The business will operate only when classes of 45-50 minutes each are scheduled.

Mr. Scavo explained that Mr. Montague, Environmental Specialist, reported that the ECC found this application acceptable and offered no comments or recommendations

Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, commented that this application should be considered "just as" the Torres Tae Kwan Do application was considered for the same plaza in 2009.

Mr. Scavo explained that this proposal is "consistent with the existing Special Use Permit for the property:" the Planning Board may issue a reaffirmation to the Chief Zoning Officer that the existing permit covers the proposed use. No additional review is required.

Mr. Bianchi explained that, after review of the documents submitted for review, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P. C. offered 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. However, in reviewing the overall scope of work, it appears that no other involved/interested agencies having jurisdiction need to be part of the SEQRA process. The project resides within the Town's B-4A (Highway Business Retail) district. Pursuant to Section 208-50.2(C) of the Town Zoning Code, the proposal for a commercial recreation facility is permitted as a special use within the B-4A zoning district. Review of the concept plan submitted indicates that that the bulk lot requirements for the zoning district are met, however, for clarity, the plan should list of applicable bulk lot requirements as existing and proposed to ensure conformance to Section 208-50.3. The plans should provide information indicating that the proposed use will have adequate parking that satisfies the requirements of Section 208-99(B). Should the project proposed any exterior renovations, the Planning Board should be furnished with architectural drawings and/or materials of construction

as appropriate. After reviewing a more detailed site plan presented at this evening's meeting, Mr. Bianchi state that parking requirements were clearly satisfied.

Mr. Hartnett, representative of the Trails Subcommittee of the Open Space, Trails, and Riverfront Committee, asked that the applicant place a bike rack near the entranceway to the new facility. Mr. Barker agreed to install this item as requested.

Mr. Ophardt moved, seconded by Ms. Paulsen, to approve Special Use Permit #80952 to permit the operation of a commercial recreational facility in a B4A zoning district pursuant to Section 208-45C(1)(a) of the Town Code: this is a reaffirmation of Special Use Permit #80732 that was approved by the Planning Board on April 14, 2009. The motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Koval moved, seconded by Mr. Ophardt, adjournment of the meeting at 8:50p.m. The motion was unanimously carried. The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held Wednesday, November 13, 2013 due to the Veterans Day holiday.

NOTE: Due to a malfunction of the recording equipment, no audio record of this meeting is available.

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