

**TOWN OF SCHODACK    COUNTY OF RENSSELAER    STATE OF NEW  
YORK**

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING – July 16, 2007**

**CALLED TO ORDER BY: CHAIRMAN PETER GOOLD AT: 7:04 p.m.**

**PRESENT**

**Peter Goold, Chairman  
Chairman  
Wayne Johnson  
John LaVoie  
Paul Puccio  
Nadine Fuda, Director  
Tim Nugent, Esq.  
Richard Laberge, Planning Board Engineer  
Melissa Knights, Secretary**

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

**Denise Mayrer, Vice  
  
G. Jeffrey Haber  
Sylvester Kedzierski**

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mark Bonin, 510 Muitzeskill Road drafted a letter stating his concerns on the development of the proposed Schodack Landing Estates, His letter has been added to their file (# 2006-11).

Tim Craft, resident spoke about his concerns on the Schodack Landing Estates and submitted a map to be added to the file. (#2006-11)

Jay Silkworth, Schodack Landing Resident spoke about the concept of a cluster development and that Schodack Landing Estates does not resemble what a cluster development should be, and wonders if the board understands what the guidelines are for such a project.

Betsy Craft, Schodack Landing Resident wanted to remind the board that they have the authority granted to them by the Town of Schodack in article 9 - paragraph 281 to propose conditions on the project where it is warranted. In addition, she requests the board be scrupulous, to make sure that this project is of the highest quality. The current plan is much different from what was presented at the public hearing, maybe another public hearing is warranted.

**Public Comment closed at 7:11**

**MINUTE APPROVAL—DATE**

Johnson moved, Puccio seconded that the minutes be approved as amended.

3 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Johnson, LaVoie, Puccio

Oppose:

Abstain: Goold

**Victoria Moore                    Z654-07/R-20/201.12-1-5                    RECOMMENDATION TO  
ZBA**

19 North Overlook

Proposed – Area Variance

Victoria Moore was present for this meeting

Mrs. Moore stated that the reason for the variance was to put a 20 x 29 ½ addition on the right side of the house, also explained that the front yard setback runs through the middle of the existing house.

Mr. Puccio questions the amount of space.

Mrs. Moore stated that her lot is 220 ft by 100 ft.

Mr. Johnson asked about the overhead wires and if that was a right of way for Niagara Mohawk.

Mrs. Moore stated that the wires are her service connection.

Member discussion on the problem with the set back and the board decided on “**NO**” recommendation to the ZBA.

This item will be reviewed at the next ZBA meeting held on July 19, 2007.

**Steven Komp for Mr. Pier    Z655-07/RA/179.-5-25.214    RECOMMENDATION  
TO ZBA**

**10 Palmer Road**

**Proposed Front Yard Setback**

Steven Komp, contractor, and Nick Demos, Project Engineer, were present for this meeting.

Mr. Komp stated he measured the front yard set back from Palmer Road but did not do so from Rt. 150. And in doing so, the foundation is 33 feet from Rt. 150. They are requesting a variance for the Rt. 150 front yard setback.

Mr. Demos states the house faces Palmer Road and is well over the 50 ft front yard setback. When they did go back and measured the setback form Rt. 150 it was done from the pavement not from the boundary line, Either way the set back is incorrect. They are requesting the board to consider Palmer Road the front yard and Rt. 150 the side yard set back.

Mr. Johnson spoke about a letter written by Gary Ziegler Schodack Building Inspector. Stating that they should not pour the foundation until the measurements for each front yard set back has been checked. And asked why that was not done before putting in the footings. (copy of letter in file # Z655-07)

Mr. Komp explained that they already had the footings in, and had misunderstood where the 50 ft set back was supposed to be. He measured from the pavement not from the boundary.

Mr. Johnson asked, when they looked at the location of the foundation footings, did they not notice how close they were to Rt. 150?

Mr. Komp stated that they had misunderstood and made a mistake.

Mr. Johnson feels that an unfavorable recommendation is in order; they were given notice that the foundation location was wrong and they did not rectify the problem.

Mr. Puccio asked how the code is written, and if it stated that, a corner lot must have two front yard setbacks.

Mr. Nugent states that is correct. No matter what road the house faces, a corner lot has two 50 ft. front yard setbacks.

Mr. Puccio asked to make it perfectly clear the building department had in fact told the contractor that the set back was incorrect, before they poured the concrete.

Mr. Komp stated that Mr. Ziegler from the building dept. had asked them if they were 50 ft. from the boundary, he thought that meant from the road.

Mr. Puccio asked what the site looks like today.

Mr. Komp states the foundation, septic, and driveway are in but not the house.

Chairman Gould stated this would go to the Zoning Board. Meeting to be held on July 19, 2007.

Johnson moved, Puccio seconded an “**unfavorable**” recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Goold, Johnson, LaVoie, Puccio  
Oppose: None

**Kohler Home Builders, LLC.      2007-10/R-40,R-20/210.-7-39.11      SITE**  
**PLAN**  
**US Rt.9 & Schodack Drive**  
**Proposed – PD-2 / Residential and Commercial**

Steven Hart, Hart Engineering, was present for this meeting.

Mr. Hart talked about a letter from the land use Corridor study dated July 2006. They had picked out some of the items that were in support of the PD2 overlay.

There have been no changes made to the plan since the last meeting.

Mr. Laberge spoke about his letter dated July 12, 2007, on the planned development application for a commercial retail and multi family units to be located on Rt. 9 and Schodack Drive. In addition, request the board to start the 60-day review process on the PD application, then a report can be submitted to the Town Board.

Members discussed if there is significant information to go ahead and start the 60-day process.

Chairman Goold asked Mr. Hart if he agrees to everything in the Laberge letter.

Mr. Hart stated yes he agrees with the items.

Chairman Goold asked the board for a motion to certify that the information on the PD2 application by Kohler Home Builders is complete.

Puccio moved, LaVoie seconded.

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.  
Ayes: Goold, Johnson, LaVoie, Puccio  
Oppose: None

**Thomas Rudolph      2007-16/HC/200.-6-7      SITE**  
**PLAN**  
**1800 US Rt.9**  
**Proposed – Bar and Restaurant**

Thomas Rudolph, applicant was present for this meeting.

Mr. Rudolph stated that he would like to reopen the Hillcrest Tavern and bring it back as a family restaurant and bar.

Chairman Goold spoke about the site plan and the only thing that Mr. Rudolph wants to do is put in a second bathroom.

Mr. Rudolph states that is correct and one wall needs to be removed. Nothing is to be changed on the out side of the building with the exception of updating the sign.

Chairman Goold questions the amount of parking.

Mrs. Fuda states that the square foot of the restaurant is 1200 sq ft for patrons who would require about 14 parking spaces and the site plan shows 22 spaces for parking.

### **Thomas Rudolph Continued...**

Chairman Goold asked about the type of food, he plans to serve and if it going to be a family type setting.

Mr. Rudolph states that it will include Italian dishes, steaks, and food of that nature and yes, he wants it to be a family restaurant.

Puccio moved, LaVoie seconded **APPROVAL** of **SITE PLAN** contingent upon the following conditions:

**- That the parking be delineated to include no fewer then the 22 parking spaces.**

4 Ayes, 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Goold, Johnson, LaVoie, Puccio

Oppose: None

**Schodack Plaza** **2007-17/HC/189.-5-11**  
**SITE PLAN**  
**1649 Columbia Turnpike**  
**Proposed – Retail Store**  
**Tractor Supply Store**

Rodger Keeting, Chazen Company. Engineer and Peter Lutz Esq. were present for this meeting.

Mr. Keeting states that the former Grand Union will become the new Tractor Supply store and the two end stores (former Ann's Hallmark and Rite Aide) are to be torn down to become the display and storage area for the tractors and out side lawn equipment. He also states that they would have a display area in the

front of the plazas parking lot by Rt. 9 & 20. Utilizing the existing parking spaces to display items such as Lawn tractors & snow blowers etc. The existing island in front of the Hallmark store will be removed for easier access of the delivery trucks. They will use the existing public water and septic systems. They require about 109 parking spaces and with the adjustments to the site, the available parking is 169 spaces.

Chairman Goold asked if the yard would hold anything other than out door goods such as lawn furniture, garden supplies, lawn tractors and things of that nature.

Mr. Keeting states that is correct, it will be blocked off by a stockade fence.

Mr. Johnson asked about signage and the front display area, if they need special review or approvals to have the display by the road.

Chairman Goold wondered about the setback from the highway.

### **Schodack Plaza Tractor Supply Store Continued...**

Mr. Keeting states that this is not going to be an enclosed area, the display areas will just take up the few existing parking spaces and then the items will be returned to the fenced in yard in the evening.

Mr. Keeting states that the screening will be an 8 ft high chain link fence with an entrance in front and the back for deliveries.

Mr. Laberge asked if the display area will remain at the same grade level and will not be raised, and questioned the heavy-duty asphalt.

Mr. Keeting stated that they are not going to change the grade just eliminate a few parking spaces by Rt. 9 & 20. The heavy-duty asphalt is for handling a larger style of tractor that may be on sale. No items are smaller than a regular size vehicle.

Mr. Puccio asked about the type of products that they sell, commercial, residential or farming.

Mr. Keeting states that the vendor caters to the recreational farmer. Someone with a couple of acres, horses and who likes to cut their own lawn. They also carry pet supplies, hardware, snow blowers and things of that nature.

Mr. Puccio wanted to clarify that the equipment displayed out by the road is not the size of a construction vehicle, just regular size lawn tractors.

Mr. Laberge asked about the type of fence is going to be used for the display area next to the store. He also asked about the improvements to Kraft Road and the possible pedestrian connection between Kraft Road and the rest of the plaza. He recommends that we make planning provisions for a five-foot multi purpose walk way and have the applicant place it on the map.

Mr. Johnson asked about the one light pole and if that was all they require.

Mr. Keeting states that there will be lighting attached to the building to light up the storage or display area

Mr. Johnson asked if they were going to use down lighting.

Mr. Keeting stated that was correct.

Mr. Johnson asked if the vendor is aware of the town sign restrictions.

Mrs. Fuda explained that the Plaza it self has a sign out by Rt. 9, and is allowed 100 square feet for everything within the Plaza. Each business is allowed 32 square feet.

### **Schodack Plaza Tractor Supply Store Continued...**

Mr. Keeting stated that they are aware of the signing restriction, and are not looking for a variance. What is allowed is fine.

Mr. Johnson asked if the display by Rt. 9 would have a sign or just the equipment and a sale type banner on display.

Mr. Keeting stated that is correct just the equipment and some sort of banner will be there.

Mr. Puccio states that the only condition from the board is that a portion of land (easement) is set aside for a future walkway from Kraft Road and the Plaza is added to the plans. Other then that everything else can be approved.

Chairman Gould asked if they would show the sidewalk on the plans.

Mr. Keeting states that a note can be added to the plans showing the area set aside for the walkway.

Mr. Nugent stated that this is going to be approved with the condition that the applicant delineate on the map a five foot sidewalk connecting Kraft Road to the plaza which will be installed at a future date.

Mr. Puccio stated that it should be listed as a proposed sidewalk

Puccio moved, Johnson seconded **APPROVAL** of **SITE PLAN** contingent upon the following condition:

- **Approximate location of proposed future sidewalk to be delineated on the map.**

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Goold, Johnson, LaVoie, Puccio

Oppose: None

**De Brino Calking**

**2007-18/HC/210.-7-23.2**

**SITE PLAN**

**US Rt.9**

**Proposed – Addition of Building and Shed**

Dave Seaman Engineer, was present for this meeting.

Mr. Seaman States that the proposed additional building will be 1440 sq ft and the shed will be 2000 sq ft. The site coverage for this lot in Highway Commercial is 35%, with these additions the site covering will be 13%. He presented photographs to the board to show what the site currently looks like.

**De Brino Calking Continued...**

Chairman Goold discusses that the owner uses small trucks for his business.

Mr. Seaman stated that the site is not for customers use just for applicant's employees.

Mr. Johnson asked where the access to the new building and shed would be.

Mr. Seaman states that the access to the shed will be from the driveway that passes along the side of it.

Mr. Johnson asked if the shed would be an open or closed unit.

Mr. Seaman states that the shed will be open, the additional building will be enclosed, and will follow lines of the existing units.

Chairman Goold states that this is an allowed use in this zone so the only question is of the site plan it self and the circulation around the units.

Mr. Johnson asked about the open shed on the other side of the building.

Mr. Seaman states that is the existing shed is used to store equipment out of the weather and that unit was previously approved.

Chairman Goold asked about the distance between the buildings for the trucks to drive in and around the property.

Mr. Seaman states that there is 20 feet between the structures for the trucks.

Chairman Goold asked if the neighbors had a problem with the encroachment to their property.

Mr. Seaman stated that the neighbor has voiced their objections on the encroachment.

Mr. Johnson asked if the shed was built under building department review.

Mr. Seaman stated that it was not. The shed on the other side was approved and one of the employees took it upon him self to build the second shed with out thinking that a second permit was needed.

Mr. Johnson asked if there should be a review done on the shed for code purposes.

#### De Brino Calking Continued...

Mr. Seaman stated that he has plans ready to be submitted to the building department, and has completed an engineering review on the structure with suggestions for modifications.

Mrs. Fuda states that the applicant had come into the planning department last year for a site plan modification and when the inspector went to the site there was not one but two sheds, they are a mirror image each other.

Mr. Johnson asked if the building does not meet code, they would then have to make adjustment to do so.

Mrs. Fuda states that is correct.

Chairman Goold states that the only concern is the parking and circulation around the site, noting the building has been there for 70 years or more.





is requesting the wet lands be an easement on the two lots which limits the amount of space for each house and septic.

Mr. Berger states that is correct but they eliminated lot 12 to make more room and he said that they could move the border of lot 27 as well.

Mr. Laberge states he will complete a detailed review letter (see below) and get it to the board and the applicant for further discussion.

Chairman Goold asked Mr. Berger if he would agree to come back an August 20<sup>th</sup> to discuss the new review letter and then follow up later with a public hearing.

Mr. Berger states yes, and believes he could have a complete set of plans at 50 scale for the next meeting.

All parties agree to come back for the next meeting on August 20 2007.

*Laberge Letter dated July 23, 2007*

*We are in receipt of a preliminary subdivision plan for the above referenced property dated June 19,2007. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), dated June 2007 was also submitted. This plan was reviewed by this office as a sketch plan (Letter dated January 16,2007, and discussed by the Town of Schodack Planning Board November 20, 2006. We offer the following sketch review comments:*

- 1. All Lots are a minimum of 60,000 sq. ft. as required in an RA Zone. Most of the lots appear to fully comply with the 200-foot minimum width, and 200 minimum depth. However, Lot 1 is 200 foot deep for only a portion of the Lot. The area of the Lot that is at least 200 foot deep is approximately 40,000 sq. ft.*
- 2. Usable land on Lots 13 and 27 is questionable. The houses are shown abutting the ACOE wetland; approval of this layout of units should also come from the ACOE, as this will mean no back yard for Lot 27, and no side yard for Lot 13.*

### **Sidney Chavin Continued...**

- 3. It appears that the house on Lot 26 is located inside a 100-foot buffer area. Please clarify the 100-foot buffer area.*
- 4. Both roadway entrances are shown without storm water collection and drainage facilities. How and where will the water flow in these areas?*
- 5. Certification of site distance for each entrance will be required on the next submission.*
- 6. Landing areas for both roadways, and the cul-de-sac, are required. As profiled, each seems to come to the roadway center, or edge, directly into a 3% slope*

7. *Lot 16 is shown with a separate entry onto County Route 7. No grading plan was provided for Lot 16 or the proposed driveway connection to County Route 7. A driveway consistent with Town regulations is required.*
8. *A future connection to adjacent lands between Lot 6 & 7 to Lands of Heuman and Passmann should be substituted for the Proposed Future Road. Preliminary design of the connections should be engineered to ensure enough R.O.W. is reserved.*
9. *It was noted at the meeting referenced above, that initial soil test turned out well, but the EAF submitted notes that 80 percent of the site is poorly drained. It was recommended that numerous test pits be performed before the next submittal, and some percolation testing also be performed so that a final lot layout on the next submittal is better defined. The design engineer provided this information however the locations of these test pits should be shown on the plans.*
10. *The grading for the drain fields, and the septic tank/pump station layout, should be provided for the next submission. The drain fields for lots proposed as raised systems with 4 feet of fill, may impact wetland areas near the drain fields. The ACOE should review the impact of these fields before final design.*
11. *The proposed water quality and storm water management ponds are proposed on home lots. As such, they must be located in easements, and maintained by a Homeowner's Association. The Town of Schodack does not own or maintain stormwater management areas.*
12. *Some proposed well locations do not appear to meet the requirement of being 200 from drain fields if downhill from the drain field.*
13. *A Homeowners association must maintain the center grass island of the cul-de-sac.*
14. *Pedestrian provisions have not been addressed (See item 7 of our January 16, 2007 letter).*
15. *Roadway centerline data is required for the next submission.*
16. *The site seems to drain predominately to the west, towards Route 7, across the property of Dufur. This submission has not shown pipe crossings, elevations, and a full stormwater layout, which will show how the adjoining property will be protected from*

**Sidney Chavin Continued...**

- additional drainage impacts. Please indicate how the point discharge from micro pool 2 will be routed around Lands of Hubbard and Prusky.*
17. *A full SWPPP has been submitted and will be reviewed after the next submittal. All storm water details should be provided on the plans with the next submission.*
  18. *Well and septic layouts will require final approval by the Rensselaer County Health Department.*
  19. *Street trees, monuments, and details should be provided in the next submission.*

20. *Lot bearings and distances will be required for the next submission. Note that the "Subdivision Plat" sheet for the next submission should include zoning and survey information only; it should not include buildings, topography, etc.*
21. *The location of the concrete truck wash area should be reevaluated. Due to the closeness of it to the drain field area on Lot 17, vehicles could potentially damage the drain field area.*
22. *After final grading plans are prepared, the location of silt fencing should be closer to the cleared area, to limit clearing areas that are not required to be cleared.*
23. *Sub area 5, existing conditions, appears to have a small area of offsite flows coming onto the property, which needs to be accounted for. This should be verified for the next submittal.*
24. *A note should be added to the plans noting that all roof drains will drain so that the roof runoff will pass through water quality structures, i.e. micro pools. This appears easily achievable on all Lots except Lot 16, which could be evaluated separately.*
25. *Given the steep grades, the driveway for lots 14, 15, 16, and 17 should be reevaluated and shared driveways should be considered with appropriate easements between lots.*
26. *The vertical curve at Station 21 + 70 should be extended to provide minimum K value of 30.*
27. *Due to the amount of information provided and requested on the plans the next submission should be done at 1 inch = 50 feet or 1 inch = 60 feet for clarity.*
28. *Rensselaer County Highway Department review is required.*
29. *Written comments from the appropriate emergency services should be solicited by the applicant based upon the current plan and profile.*

*We recommend the applicant incorporate these comments into the next submission for review. Please contact our office with any questions or comments on the above.*

**Schodack Landing Estates                      2006-11/RA/226.-1-16.11**  
**SUBDIVISION**  
**Schodack Landing Rd & Muitzeskill Rd**  
**Proposed 31 – Lot Subdivision**

Lynn Sipperly, Engineer, L. Sipperly & Associates was present for this meeting

Mr. Sipperly states that the plans have changes since the last time it was presented to the board and Mr. Boll had completed an investigation on the

questions that were asked by the board which includes wetlands delineation, archaeological investigation on phase 1, and a hydro geologic investigation.

- Wetlands delineation. The two entrances off Muitzeskill Rd. would impact the wet lands. The southerly entrance affected 3 to 4 tenths of an acre, and was taken off the plans.
- Archaeological investigation was completed which includes a phase 1A literature search to see if there are any historical structures in the area. In addition, phase 1B field search and perform testing on the soil to see if there are any artifacts on the site. In addition, no artifacts were found; a written letter is to be submitted by the archaeologist stating that the subdivision will have no impact to the cultural resources that are on the site. As for the historical buildings such as Mr. Hodges home the Church and parsons home the archaeologist recommends a buffer or screening to be put in to cover the subdivision from their view.
- Water supply, there were two wells already on site and the applicant has put in 4 more wells which were installed by Jeff Smith Well Drilling. Spectra engineering and environmental firm were consulted to direct the operation and to perform the testing. They are ready to submit a report to the town and the health department the results to the hydro geological study that the wells are able to produce a minimum 5 gallons per minute and up to 10.

The main reason that we are here is to bring the board up to speed as to where they are so far with the subdivision and the water supply.

Mr. Puccio asked about lots 9 & 10 and the fact that even though the lots have 77 to 80 thousand square feet the actual amount of the lot that is useable is quite a bit less because of the wetlands. Is the remaining land viable as a building lot?

Mr. Sipperly stated that they are viable for a house with well and septic.

Mr. Puccio asked about the wells, how deep are they and where they are on the map.

Mr. Sipperly states the wells are bedrock and about 230 to 270 feet deep.

Mr. Puccio asked if they drilled through the top gravel area where a water table was located, and went further down into the bedrock. Is that the water supply for the development?

### **Schodack Landing Estates Continued...**

Mr. Sipperly stated that is correct, the water was tested at the interface of the gravel level and did not find an adequate supply. They had to proceed further into the bedrock.

Mr. Sipperly explained where the wells are located and stated that they are all near the center of the site.

Mr. Johnson asked about the Church conservation easement and the access to it.

Mr. Sipperly stated that the easement is part of lot 21, it is a large lot and it will be restricted for development because of the conservation easement and wetlands.

Mr. Johnson asked if the lot 21 will have a deed stating they have ownership rights but not able to develop.

Mr. Sipperly states that is part of the lot but there then there will be a conservation easement by meets and bounds indicating no development.

Mr. Johnson asked if they considered not developing lot 27 and making that part of the no development conservation to avoid the impacts on the historical district.

Mr. Sipperly states that is was part of the previous plan, the area along the Schodack Landing road is all wooded. His conversations with the archeologist is that if they provide a 100 foot no clear buffer zone that should provide the normal screening that is recommended by New York State Historic Preservation Office.

Mr. Johnson asked who the open space parcel be passed on to.

Mr. Sipperly stated that they have not focused on that but there are three options, one being the home owners association who will have sole use of the property, the second is a land conservancy group which will also have restricted use for the lot owners. And the third would be town ownership and the land could be open to the public, But he understand the third is not an option.

Mr. Johnson asked about the Cluster Development and most of the lots are 60 thousand square feet and some have less then the 200 foot frontage. Do you know how many of the lots do not meet the RA requirement?

Mr. Sipperly states that it depends on what you look at, example on the cul-de-sac some of the lots have road frontage of 103 feet but when you look at the lot from the 50 ft. front yard set back that's where you will see the 200 feet requirement.

**Schodack Landing Estates Continued...**

Mr. Puccio asked about the historic district and the delineation, Did we make any progress on the designation of a historic district and if it created any restraints on the development.

Mr. Nugent states that he had not turned anything up that would cause the board to put any restrictions on the development, but he is still looking into one aspect and

would rather not get into it at this time until it has been fully investigated. He also asked Mr. Sipperly if there is a portion of the property in the historic district?

Mr. Sipperly states that is correct, there is three maybe four lots that are in the historic district. His research shows that the historic district was set up by the town and not at the state level. There were no boundary restriction it was just an area set up to recognize the sensitivity of structures and homes within this area. This is one of the reasons that they went ahead and completed a full archeological investigation in this area so they could approach the New York States Parks, Recreational and Historic Preservation for their input on the buffer and screening between the subdivision and the historic structures.

Chairman Goold stated that we have sent a letter to Ruth Pierpont the Director of Historic Preservation of Field Services Bureau of Parks and Recreation offices on October 26, 2006 and Ms. Pierdont has not responded to our request. We will have Mrs. Fuda follow up with her to see where we stand.

Mr. Laberge asked Mr. Sipperly about the June 26<sup>th</sup> letter stating that they did complete a phase one archaeological, has it been submitted to SHPO and does the report talk about the historic district?

Mr Sipperly states that the text of the report has to be completed before submitting and it does include the historic district.

Chairman Goold asked Mr. Laberge and Mr. Nugent if they feel that the applicant can proceed with the current plan # 4 and the rest of the engineering.

Mr. Nugent responds on the waver request for one entrance into the development and states that a project with 20 or more units must have two entrances. There are some conditions that the board must consider such as emergency access and the safety of the residents before they can make a ruling in this waver.

Mr. Sipperly states that they want to make Oakdale Drive a Boulevard which consists of two separate operating traffic lanes, It would be constructed in a way that there will be sufficient width on either side of the center median so two way traffic could be maintained at all times.



physical bounds to the lot that they wanted, stream courses, hedge rows, and edges of fields also the top of the land was left for access should they want to do some logging in the future.

### **Anna Zweig Continued...**

Mr. Johnson asked about the two access points, the fact that the frontage is split. One access is 60-feet and the other is 145-feet, he asked if this would qualify as the 200-foot frontage.

Chairman Goold states that he does not know of anything listed stating that it has to be continuous.

Mr. Van Alstyne states that he would clarify the setbacks on the map.

Chairman Goold states that the setbacks are not the issue. If you have more lots the code demands two access points, and they already have that and should they want to develop at some future date.

Mr. Johnson asked where the second driveway is going to be located.

Mr. Van Alstyne states that it is going to be located on the 60-foot section. Mr. Johnson asked about the 145-foot parcel where the stream runs, is it all wetlands.

Mr. Van Alstyne states there are two streams that run through this property. However, there is no DEC wetlands map listed for this property in there database.

This area is certainly wet and is not a good place to put an entrance. The 60-foot access goes over an old farm road so it was a natural place to put the entrance.

Member discussed the size of the lot, and the section that they want to subdivide.

Chairman Goold asked if everyone would agree to come back for a public hearing on August 6 2007.

Mr. Zweig agreed to the August 6 date

All members also agreed.

## **Planning Board Recommendations**

### **A. Proposed Local Law No. 5 of 2007, adding a new chapter entitled Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems to the Code of the Town of Schodack.**

Puccio moved, LaVoie seconded

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.  
Ayes: Goold Johnson, LaVoie, Puccio  
Oppose: None

### **B. Proposed Local Law No. 6 OF 2007, adding a new Article 17 to Chapter 19 of the Code of the Town of Schodack, entitled Erosion and Sedimentation Control.**

## **Planning Board Recommendations Continued...**

Johnson moved, LaVoie seconded

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.  
Ayes: Goold, Johnson, LaVoie, Puccio  
Oppose: None

### **C. Ratify and Affirm that Chairman Peter Goold solicit price quotes for proposals (RFP) on a Draft Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Schodack**

Puccio moved, Johnson seconded

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.  
Ayes: Goold, Johnson, LaVoie, Puccio  
Oppose: None

**ADJOURN**

LaVoie moved, Johnson seconded that the Planning Board meeting be adjourned. There being no objections, Chairman Goold adjourned the meeting at 9:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nadine Fuda  
Director of Planning & Zoning

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

