

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

PLANNING BOARD

ROCCO FERRARO
Chairman

ROBERT WILCOX
Attorney

PAULA COOPER
Secretary



MEMBERS

Emad Andarawis
Eric Ophardt
Ram Lalukota
Andrew Neubauer
Denise Bagramian
Keith Martin

(alternate) Jennyfer Gleason

Planning Board Minutes
June 8th, 2021

Those present at the June 8th, 2021 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board: R. Ferraro, Chairman, E. Andarawis, R. Lalukota, A. Neubauer, E. Ophardt, K. Martin, J. Gleason – Alternate Member

Those absent were: D. Bagramian

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

COVID-19 Note: Executive Order No. 202.1 suspends Article 7 of the Public Officers Law (also known as the Open Meetings Law), to the extent necessary to permit any public body to meet and take such actions authorized by law without allowing the public to be physically present at the meeting. The order also authorizes public bodies to meet remotely by conference call or similar service. For the Public Hearing Agenda Items during these unprecedented conditions, the Planning Board will provide the public reasonable and meaningful opportunities to submit comments via online videoconferencing technology during the meeting and in writing via email or mailed written comments.

Mr. Ferraro, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Ferraro stated that Ms. Gleason would be a voting member tonight in the absence of Ms. Bagramian

Minutes Approval:

Mr. Ophardt moved, seconded by Mr. Lalukota, approval of the minutes of the May 11th, 2021 Planning Board meeting as written. The motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Lalukota moved, seconded by Mr. Ophardt, approval of the minutes of the May 26th, 2021 Planning Board meeting as written. The motion was unanimously carried.

Public Hearings:

None

Old Business:

2021-014 Route 146 Technology Building Site Plan

Applicant is proposing construction of a 10,520 SF two story Technology building with approximately 20 parking spaces with access onto NYS Route 146., Rt 146, Zoned: B-5, Status: PB Prelim Review - Poss. Determination SBL: 270.-1-20.111 To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: EDP Applicant: Woodhaven Land Partners **Last Seen on: 3-9-21**

Mr. Martin joined the meeting at 7:12 p.m.

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Gavin Vuillaume – EDP- Mr. Vuillaume stated that he is here tonight for a site plan on a parcel for a previously approved 3 lot subdivision located in the vicinity of the corner of Waite Road and Route 146. He stated that the project parcel is 7.47 acres that was previously subdivided. He stated that the land is heavily wooded and has wetlands on it. Mr. Vuillaume stated that the wetlands are located on the eastern and western parts of the parcel and the property is zoned B5- Corporate Commerce Zone. Mr. Vuillaume stated that the building on the subdivided parcel would be a 10,500 square foot mixed building with office and manufacturing space which would

house the same tenant. He stated that there would be tractor trailers occasionally on premises and it would be approximately one time per week for deliveries. He stated that the internal road system would be able to handle this type of traffic and vehicle weight with access to a loading dock on the property. Mr. Vuillaume stated that the roadway would be full access with visitor parking lot in the front of the building and another parking area for employees to the rear of the building. He stated that feedback from the last meeting had the applicant remove the parking spaces from the side of the building. Mr. Vuillaume showed on the Zoom screen an example of how the building would be laid out on the property as well as parking spaces. He showed on the Zoom screen a possible future road extension for the rear property. He stated that DOT has responded as ok with the entranceway and road access from State Route 146. Mr. Vuillaume showed a conceptual sketch of the building on the Zoom screen and noted that the applicant is not looking for high visibility to the roadway and added that some existing vegetation will remain. He stated that the project would have 3 bio retention areas due to high stormwater as well as a picnic/patio area and also showed the landscaping plan on the screen.

Staff Comments:

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 6/1/21 stating:

- A fire apparatus turn-around will be required on the south side of the building.
- A tractor trailer is an articulating vehicle and an aerial apparatus is not. Use the same apparatus turning template as used previously to show the road works and/or provide the template proposed with dimensions shown.
- SWPPP comments to follow.

Wade Schoenborn, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention:

1. Postal verification
2. Provide fire apparatus turn around on south side of the building
3. Provide fire apparatus access plan

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 6/4/21 with the following comments:

1. Please provide test hole results with the seasonal high-water elevations. Detail 4/9 - Bioretention & Outlet Structure - specify Geotex 451 which allows water flow through the geotextile. There is a minimum 2' separation between the filter bottom and groundwater.
2. Add to the plans and remove any disturbances that may lie within the Land Conservation District. Per Clifton Park Town Code section 208-69.1 (A)(2) Classified streams located in the Town of Clifton Park that have been indexed and/or mapped by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, and a fifty-foot adjacent area (buffer) on each side of the outer bank of the high-water mark. Per the NYSDEC Environmental Resource Mapper there is a mapped stream that runs through this project.

3. The outlets of the catch-basins in all three proposed bioretention areas appear to be elevated above the perforated underdrain and possibly higher into the bioretention soil, creating a bathtub effect, therefore omitting the designed storage voids. The underdrains shall not be obstructed to ensure proper water quality treatment.
4. Update Section 6.0 of the Stormwater Management Narrative to coincide with the proposed practices for this project. Update Soil Notes in detail 4/9 Bioretention & Outlet Structure with the existing conditions for this project.

The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 6/3/21 and issued a memo recommending:

1. There is a Class C stream located at the northern portion of the proposed parking area. It is recommended that the Planning Board require a curb and/or signage to indicate that there is an environmentally sensitive area adjacent to the parking area. Parking lot snow that contains salt or other materials should not be shunted into this area.
2. The Applicant should reserve and display on the site plan or subdivision proposal sufficient Rights of Way to accommodate multi-use trails to interconnect the proposed property with existing and contemplated trail networks, as defined in the Town Trails Master Plan. The ECC requests clarification of ownership of the mentioned sewer easement. Clarification as to whether a multi-use surface trail is permitted on this easement is critical to fulfilling the Town Train Master Plan.
3. The proposed dumpster area is in close proximity to the proposed Bioretention area. Due to the probability of food and liquid wastes leaking from the on-site dumpster(s) into a storm water catch basin and/or surface water body, the ECC recommends the applicant enclose the area (i.e. roof) on an impervious surface with a berm surrounding the dumpster(s) that accept food and liquid wastes. If necessary, the Applicant will need to periodically pump out the accumulated wastes within the bermed area to avoid any overflow.
4. The ECC is concerned if additional parking spaces are required for the proposed 6,000 SF addition can be accommodated by the existing stormwater management areas. Banked parking spaces shall not be considered approved until proposed to the planning board in a future application.

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a letter dated 6/1/21 with recommendations he made:

1. Add the assigned postal verification address of 1335 Route 146 on this Site Plan.
2. As previously noted, the 6,000 sq.ft. addition will require additional town approvals when the property owner desires to build such addition in the future.
3. The applicant should confirm if they have had any correspondence to date with NYS DOT regarding the curb-cut proposed onto Route 146 and provide a written summary to those discussions. A culvert under the driveway within the NYS DOT right-of-way may be necessary. 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.

4. From the documentation submitted to date, there does not appear to be any disturbance proposed to regulated wetlands. The applicant should confirm if that is accurate.
5. The applicant is required to note where the trees cleared for the site will be taken to for processing. The Town has had a recent violation by a different property owner within the B-5 Zoning District of a site not permitted to accept felled trees and having an active outdoor mulch processing operation with heavy grinding equipment, in violation of their approved site plan and Town zoning.
6. Per the NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual section 6.4.4, required elements Bioretention systems shall consist of four feet deep planting soil beds.
7. Planting schedules and plans shall follow NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual Section 6.4.5 Landscaping. Provide a planting plan with spacing as the design guidance provides. Trees should be included in the planting plan as well.
8. Add installation of conduit under the pavement on the site plan, for future designated EV Charging Stations. Such infrastructure accommodations at the time of new construction will further the goals of the 2016, "Capital District Electric Vehicle Charging Station Plan". The costs to run conduit at the time of new construction greatly decreases costs to install EV Charging Stations in the future since pavement within the parking area will not need to be torn-up to run electrical connections.
9. The applicant, when working with a structural architect for the building design, shall identify an electrical panel location for convenient Photovoltaic (PV) and Electric Vehicle (EV) system inter-connections, and keep space available in the electrical panel for PV and EV circuit breaker. It is easier and more cost effective to plan at the time of new construction for future green infrastructure accommodations such as PV and EV Systems.

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter dated 6/4/21 had the following comments:

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

1. The applicant has indicated that the proposed project is located within a Phase 1A Archaeological Survey area. The applicant should provide a copy of the survey along with correspondence from SHPO.
2. The applicant has indicated that ACOE will be providing a JD letter verifying the wetlands on site. A copy of the ACOE correspondence should be provided to the Town.

SITE PLAN

3. The applicant has advised that the proposed building will be 50% office space and 50% warehousing. Pursuant to Section 208-99 of the Town Zoning, total parking required for office space is 1 space/300 SF and warehousing is 1 space/2,000 SF. The initial phase of 10,520 SF would yield 20 spaces and with the additional 6,000 SF yields a total of 12 spaces. Provide the location for banked parking spaces to accommodate the future expansion. This would also increase the required ADA spaces to two.

4. Per Comment 10 of our March 5, 2021 review, The applicant shall provide the Town documentation indicating the CPWA's ability and willingness to provide potable water to the project. Any action on the application should be conditioned upon receipt of plan approval from the CPWA.
5. Per Comment 11 of our March 5, 2021 review, The applicant shall provide the Town documentation indicating sewer districts's ability and willingness to provide sewer capacity to the project. Any action on the application should be conditioned upon receipt of plan approval from the SCSD.
6. Provide correspondence from NYSDOT approving the proposed curb cut location along Route 146.
7. Provide the proposed driveway radii on the plans meeting NYSDOT design requirements.
8. Identify the date and by whom the wetlands shown were delineated.
9. Provide information on how roof drains will be connected to the proposed storm sewer system.
10. Provide a copy of the utility and access agreement to the Town
11. Provide the metes and bounds of the proposed access and utility easement.
12. Provide light pole detail.
13. Providing a site-specific illumination plan that shows foot-candle values at pavement level for review.
14. Indicate whether there will be any roof top mechanical units that may be visible from the public roads. If there are any, screening of these units may be required.
15. Provide information on the plans to indicate how potential sump pump laterals may be positioned which shall be in conformance with Section 86-7(A)(6) of the Town Code.
16. Provide notation on the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that all upstream construction shall be completed and stabilized before connecting to the downstream infiltration practice(s) pursuant to Section 6.3.5 of the NYSSMDM.
17. The applicant shall provide a cross section detail for all of the forebay and bioretention basin shown. The cross section should provide design elevations including stone invert, pipe invert and depth of runoff by storm event as reported by the SWPPP.
18. Pursuant to Section 3.5 of the NYSSMDM, the proposed stormwater practice needs to have a conspicuous and legible sign posted. The plans need to provide the standard sign with the applicable language as well as the location.
19. Provide wetland protection fencing along perimeter of wetlands.
20. Since the stormwater management area will be owned and operated by the applicant, a maintenance agreement will need to be executed and filed with the Town.
21. Provide the soil media specifications for the Bioretention Detail. The planting soil shall meet the characteristics as established by NYSDOT.
22. Section 6.4.2 of the NYSSMDM require a minimum 2-foot separation between the bioretention filter bottom and groundwater. The SWPPP did not indicate any soil testing was conducted on site. Provide clarification that this requirement is being met.
23. Each of the bioretention systems are proposed with a clay liner. It is recommended that an impermeable liner, be utilized as it will ensure that the soil mix will remain segregated from the surrounding soils and ensure high groundwater will not compromise system functions.

24. Within the plan set, provide a generic planting plan for the bioretention areas pursuant to Section 6.4.5 of the NYSSMDM.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT NARRATIVE AND STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN

25. Provide clarification on the total acreage of the existing parcel. The plans indicate 7.4 acres, however report indicated 93 acres.
26. Identify the source of the rainfall data utilized in modeling (NYSDEC Manual or Northeast Regional Climate Center's Extreme Precipitation tables).
27. Provide calculations that the appropriate pretreatment is being provided prior to the bioretention facility pursuant to Section 6.4.3 of the NYSSMDM.
28. Identify the party that will be taking ownership of each stormwater practice proposed
29. Provide stormwater calculation sheets for the sizing of each bioretention practice.
30. Section 6.4.3 of the NYSSMDM indicates filtering practices shall generally be combined with a separate facility to provide quality controls. Provide clarification on the water quantity control measures for the site.
31. The SWPPP shall summarize the in-situ soil testing completed including infiltration tests and test pits with the results provided as an appendix to the SWPPP pursuant to Part III.B.2.d and e of GP 0-20-001.
32. The SWPPP shall include documentation that the project is eligible for permit coverage pursuant to Part I.F.4 of GP 0-20-001 with respect to threatened and endangered species. This includes both listed state and federal species. Provide all documentation / correspondences within the SWPPP once received.
33. The SWPPP shall include documentation that the project is eligible for permit coverage pursuant to Part I.F.8 of GP 0-20-001 with respect to historic properties. This includes archeological and cultural resources. Provide SHPO "no effect" letter within the SWPPP once received.

Public Comments:

Anthony LaFleche – 21 Wheeler Drive – Mr. LaFleche asked how much space is being given between Route 146 and the front parking lot. Mr. Vuillaume stated that it is 20-30 feet at the narrowest. Mr. LaFleche stated that there is a trail in plans so there should be as much space from the road to the landscaping as possible. Mr. Vuillaume stated he agrees with this and is in support of connections to the remainder of the property as well as trails. Mr. Vuillaume stated that the applicant is planning to preserve as much of the existing vegetation as possible and will provide water and sewer easements as applicable.

Wendy and Bob Wagner – 608 Waite Road - Ms. Wagner asked if there would be any EV charging stations at the new building. Mr. Vuillaume stated there would be. Ms. Wagner asked what type of tenant they are looking to house there. Mr. Vuillaume stated it is a technology based company but there is a specific tenant. Ms. Wagner stated that she feels that the patrons and

employees of the company would be able to get into the driveway but would not be able to exit due to the traffic problem. She stated that the traffic speed and turning is dangerous at this intersection. Ms. Wagner asked if a light would be put in at the intersection and stated that she asked for a decrease in speed. Mr. Ferraro stated that traffic is a concern in the area and that there needs to be an internal circulation plan for the entire site not just this parcel to mitigate possible problems on both sides of Route 146.

Mel Boxer – Ms. Boxer asked if the items in the landscaping plan have been identified yet and if so, would they be native species. Mr. Vuillaume stated they would be. Ms. Boxer asked if there would be a generator on site for any power outages. Mr. Schelansker, the developer of the site stated there are not any in the plans. Ms. Boxer asked that if one is installed that the noise is mitigated as there are homes around the property.

Mr. Ferraro stated that there was a question in the chat box asking if the manufacturing side of the building would produce mechanical noise. Mr. Dick Schelansker – developer - stated that any manufacturing noise would be confined and that the business activity involves an assembly of products and not a manufacturing operation.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Lalukota agreed that traffic is problem at the intersection and that he has driven it himself. Mr. Lalukota asked how many parking spots would be on site. Mr. Vuillaume stated that there are 20 total and about 9 would be for employees and most of the driving would take place to the rear of the building where most of the parking is located as well as the loading dock and meets the code as the site plan stands now.

Mr. Andarawis asked about how the rest of site may develop and the traffic studies need to include what may be developed on adjacent sites as there is a lot of development in the area and it needs to be looked at as a whole. Mr. Scavo stated that this site or any others would have to account for the ITE trips in proximity to the curb cut as there are many things to consider in addition to speed including turning movements in and out of sites, vehicle braking, and exiting the driveways. Mr. Scavo went through the analysis criteria that would be utilized for a signal warrant analysis and also placed the document into the chat box to share.

Mr. Ferraro stated that the traffic issue is being evaluated on a project by project basis therefore the cumulative impacts of a number of projects within the Commerce Park area are not being properly taken into account in order to identify appropriate measures to address traffic impacts . He stated that the GEIS was done 20 years ago and a follow-up needs to be done, including an internal circulation plan as the properties are being further subdivided and projects are now being proposed in the Commerce Park. Mr. Ferraro stated a meeting was held on 5/4/21 with different

members of the town to discuss the follow-up or next steps that need to be taken. Mr. Scavo stated that there have been more discussions with the Highway Safety Committee.

Mr. Ophardt asked how close to the site is to the mapped stream noted on the DEC Environmental Resource Mapper. Mr. Vuillaume stated that based on a site visit, the stream starts further north away from this site and closer to the Waite Meadows project. Mr. Ophardt asked for a plan for snow storage so it does not interfere with the wetlands. Mr. Ophardt asked for Mr. Vuillaume to explain more on the shared trail right of way. Mr. Vuillaume stated that there is an easement for the sewer line that is outside of the ditch line and is about a 20 foot easement and indicated the location on the Zoom screen and the proper language will be added to the plan. Mr. Ferraro stated that it was previously said that the applicant will add more footage to the easement if it found to be insufficient and asked it be added to the plan. Mr. Vuillaume stated that this can be done.

Mr. Martin stated that he is disappointed that DOT granted a curb cut in this area. Mr. Martin stated that he does like that the applicant is providing EV charging stations.

Mr. Neubauer stated that he agrees with Mr. Ferraro when he stated that the overall Commerce Park site is large and even though it is subdivided, it needs to be looked at as a whole under a B-5 Zoning comprehensive layout. Mr. Neubauer stated that he would like to see the final architectural design before making a decision as there are guidelines to follow in the B5 zoning. He stated that the possible future addition should be noted on the plan as a 6,000 square foot two story addition.

Mr. Ferraro stated that some of his concerns have already been talked about. He asked about access for the addition and asked if there would be a different access from the existing building. Mr. Schelansker stated that addition is for warehousing and assembly space and would be through this existing proposal. Mr. Ferraro stated that in Section 208-54 of the code it discusses front yard setbacks and for Route 146 it is a 130 foot setback, so he asked if the parking is allowed within the setback. Mr. Scavo stated that he spoke to Mr. Myers and he stated that the parking in the front is at the discretion of the Planning Board and parking is allowed in the Corporate Commerce zoning but the 130 foot setback is applicable only for the building. Mr. Ferraro stated that he is ok with parking in the front as landscaping will be preserved but would like to see additional landscaping to supplement the existing landscaping. He stated that he does however have some concerns with winter foliage. Mr. Vuillaume stated that landscaping can be added to the front of the property for screening. Mr. Ferraro asked if there would be any roof top mechanicals. Mr. Vuillaume stated there would not be.

Mr. Ferraro asked for feedback on the parking in the front yard as it relates to the code. Mr. Ophardt stated he is comfortable with the parking and thinks there is sufficient buffering with additional landscaping. Mr. Andarawis stated that he is not a fan of parking in front but this

application has a small parking area in the front and the lot is smaller. He also stated that due to this he feels the renderings of the building will be important. Mr. Martin agreed with Mr. Andarawis. Mr. Ferraro asked if the applicant can show a street view façade with landscaping for the next meeting. Mr. Schelansker stated that they would be happy to provide this as a lot of thought has been put into the design of the building.

New Business:

2021-032 10 Hemlock Drive In-Law Apartment SUP

Applicant requests SUP approval for a two family dwelling in a an R-1 Zone. Approval will require a setback variance. Existing 1 story screened in porch will be removed and replaced with a new garage and apartment. 10 Hemlock Dr, Zoned: R-1, Status: PB Concept Review
SBL: 277.6-2-41 To be reviewed by: N/A Consultant: N/A Applicant: M. Wilson

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Mark Wilson – home owner – Mr. Wilson stated that this application for an in-law apartment as well as a garage is for his mother that currently lives in another city and he feels that they can keep an eye on her and move her to a safer location. He stated that the existing one story addition would be removed to accommodate this application and a 37 foot by 38 foot addition would be added. Mr. Wilson stated that there should not be a problem with the setbacks as there is no paper road boarding him as it originally showed and he has submitted verification to the Town.

Staff Comments:

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 6/1/21 stating:

- Proposed addition seems to violate setback required from an unnamed street when development built. “Paper Street” now appear to be owned by “Popp”. Unknown if the 45’ required setback is still applicable. If so a variance will be required.

Wade Schoenborn, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention:

1. No comment

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 6/4/21 with the following comments:

1. No stormwater comments at this time.

The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 6/3/21 and issued a memo recommending:

1. The ECC recommends the following modifications to the Short Environmental Assessment Form.
 - a. Item 12b: Is the proposed action located in an archeological sensitive area? Should be checked “yes”
 - b. Item 13a: Does any portion of the site of the proposed action, or lands adjoining the proposed action, contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state, or local agency? Should be checked “yes”.

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a letter dated 6/1/21 with recommendations he made:

1. Pursuant to Local Law #6 of 2018, and the attached excerpt from the Clifton Park Town Zoning Code, if the Planning Board deems the proposed modifications acceptable in concept form, a public hearing will be schedule for preliminary consideration with a possible final determination for the application.
2. Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development for Clifton Park, noted that the project will require a setback variance. You are encouraged to work with Mr. Myers to obtain the necessary area variance. Such variance is required to be granted prior to the Planning Board taking final action on the proposed application.
3. Attached, please find a copy of the June 6th Planning Board Agenda with log-in information for you to participate in the meeting. You or a representative on your behalf are required to be in attendance for the virtual meeting to present your application and address any questions Planning Board Members may have.

Professional Comments:

No professional comments.

Public Comments:

No public comments.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Neubauer stated that he understands what the applicant wants to do and asked for clarification that the existing sunroom would be removed and the plan is to build the addition next to the existing garage so it would look like a single garage attached to a double and then add the in-law apartment to the west of the single car garage. Mr. Wilson stated that this is true. Mr. Neubauer stated that he does not want this application to turn out looking like a duplex and this is his concern so he would like to see the pitch of the roof for the addition to match the existing roof. Mr. Wilson stated that the addition needs to be taller to pitch over the existing garage roof. Mr. Neubauer stated he understands and would just like to see uniformity and that the addition fits in with the existing home and neighborhood. Mr. Neubauer suggested making the garage door 12 foot to blend in on the existing home and to have a larger window on the addition

instead of the 2 smaller ones that are shown on the plans. Mr. Wilson stated that the smaller garage door is due to stairs that would be next to them but he can look at changing them as well as the windows.

Mr. Scavo asked if the addition would have a kitchenette. Mr. Wilson stated it would. Mr. Scavo stated that this is what is triggering the SUP. Mr. Scavo stated that there are no variances required either as he verified that with Mr. Myers.

Mr. Ophardt asked why they chose to have the garage between the main home and the in-law apartment. Mr. Wilson stated he would like his mother to be able to park her car and then go directly to her apartment.

Mr. Ferraro asked that since this is a SUP for an in-law apartment and if the mother no longer lived there it could not be used for a rental. Mr. Scavo stated that it can only be used for related members of the family and if the applicant would like to use it as a rental then he would have to come back to the Planning Board for approval.

Mr. Ferraro stated that he has the same concerns as Mr. Neubauer and Mr. Ophardt in regards to the façade. He stated he would like to see a rendering of the addition with the existing building shown as well. Mr. Ferraro asked if the driveway would be expanded to accommodate the new garage. Mr. Wilson stated that it would be expanded and that 3 of the 5 trees would be removed to do so but the driveway entrance would remain the same width. Mr. Ferraro asked if the addition would be set to match the existing home. Mr. Wilson stated they would match and the siding is within 10 years old and can be matched.

Discussion Items:

None

Mr. Ophardt moved, seconded by Mr. Neubauer, adjournment of the meeting at 9:02 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on June 22nd, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Cooper

Paula Cooper, Secretary