

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING - JANUARY 6, 2014**  
**CALLED TO ORDER BY: CHAIRWOMAN DENISE MAYRER AT 7:00 p.m.**

**PRESENT**

Denise Mayrer, Chairwoman  
Jim Church  
Wayne Johnson  
John LaVoie  
Lawrence D'Angelo  
Paul Puccio  
Nadine Fuda, Director  
Attorney Robert Linville, Esq.  
Richard Laberge, Planning Board Engineer

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES — December 16, 2013**

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

6 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Church, D'Angelo, Johnson, LaVoie, Mayrer, Puccio

**15 Minute PUBLIC COMMENT**

Resident stated she represents a group of neighbors that surround the Love Lutheran Church and they object to the mutli housing units that are being proposed for that area. She handed in a letter from the Schodack side of the project (see file).

Resident spoke about the proposed age range discussed at the first meeting and the effects the R20 zone has on the age limits. He submitted a letter with his comments (see file)

Resident spoke about the April meeting and a member of the planning board asked about the impact of the pond, she submitted a letter with her concerns, on noise - odors - general construction atmosphere (see file).

Resident stated he does not live in this neighborhood and asked about the process the board goes though and what was going to happen at tonight's meeting.

Chairwoman Mayrer stated the boards engineer has reviewed the project and submitted a letter which the applicant needed to go through and address and work directly with the boards engineer and another letter will be submitted with any additional items or remaining items that need to be worked on. Tonight is going to be just a discussion on the engineers letter there is no action on the part of the board tonight.

Resident spoke about the Love Lutheran project stated this project is too large she suggest that they consider town homes, coach home something more residential then what they propose.

**SITE PLAN/ SPECIAL PERMIT**

Love Lutheran Church  
Pheasant Lane & Birchwood Dr.  
Proposed - Senior Housing

2013-5/R20/177.12-5-30

Richard Tice, Brewer Engineering, Edward Kleinke, Landscape Architect, and Pastor Henry Albrechtsen, Lover Lutheran Church were present for this meeting.

Mr. Tice stated they are presenting 5 items at tonight's meeting.

1 - pond - they are not touching the pond in Deerfield but are fixing a small depressed area on the church property that when there is an overflow from the detention basin the water flows to that depressed area, this is the body of water (ie. Pond) he was referring to and it will be eliminated.

2 - parking - because this project has a church, an annex, and will have a village center they have revised the parking area.

3 - age restriction for the occupants of the senior housing. The age starts at 65 and goes up, no one under the age of 65 will be excepted. This will be written and must be stated.

4 - the village center will be restricted to the residents of the senior housing, their friends and family, and not the outside public.

5 - they are also requesting a public hearing to be set.

Mr. Laberge read and went over his letter dated January 2, 2014 (see below)

Mr. Puccio asked about the parking, the only concern he has is using the Bethlehem standards of 1.1 parking spaces per residents, with the age of the residents he feels that they will have family visit all the time and the 81 spots are not enough.

Mr. Tice stated the Town of Schodack does not have a standard for senior housing parking, the only town that does is Bethlehem and that is what they used.

Chairwoman Mayrer stated our engineer will look at the parking as part of the concept review.

Mr. Johnson stated the letter that was submitted by the church is allowing 19 spaces based on seventeen units and the map shows 54 units which numbers are correct.

Mr. Tice stated there are also 30 garages that were not listed as parking spaces. The 19 parking spaces are open spaces only.

Mr. Johnson asked for the garages to be added to the computations of the existing parking.

Mr. Tice stated he will look into the parking and adjust the figures.

Mr. Puccio asked if the garages are in phase 1 or phase 2.

Mr. Tice stated 20 garages are in phase 2 and 10 garages are in the first phase.

Mr. Puccio asked who actually owns the property the church is on?

Pastor Albrechtsen stated the Love Lutheran Church owns the property.

Chairwoman Mayrer stated the public hearing for March 17, 2014 and we will be seeking lead agency and will be submitting the request to the surrounding entities, Such as the Town of East Greenbush and involved agencies.

#### **SITE PLAN-SPECIAL PERMIT LEAD AGENCY**

Puccio moved, Church seconded that the Planning Board seek **LEAD AGENCY** for the project known as Love Lutheran Church

6 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Church, D'Angelo, Johnson, LaVoie, Mayrer, Puccio,

Oppose: None

Laberge Letter Dated January 2, 2014

Re: Concept Plan Review

Love Lutheran Senior Housing

SPB # 2013-5

We are in receipt of a revised concept plan dated December 5, 2013, a Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) Part I dated December 6, 2013, and two other plans entitled "Landscape Elements" and "Visual Assessment" both dated December 10, 2013. In addition, a traffic study dated December 12, 2012 was previously received. We offer the following:

- 1) The project is located in an R20 residential zone and Senior Housing is permitted by Special Permit. A Special Permit and Site Plan Approval is required. A public hearing should be scheduled.

- 2) While the project lies within the Direct Recharge Area as defined by the Water Quality Control Act, (WQCA) a special permit under the WQCA is not needed since it is a residential use.
- 3) The project exceeds the Type I thresholds under SEQRA as set forth in §617.4(b)(5)(ii). As such, it should be classified as a Type I action under SEQRA and a coordinated review should be conducted.
- 4) The EAF requires revisions in the following sections:
  - a) C.2.b
  - b) D.1.a,b, c, d, e
  - c) D.2.c.iii, iv, vi
  - d) D.2.d.v
  - e) D.2.e.ii, iii, iv
  - f) D.2.f. iii
  - g) D.2.g
  - h) D.2.l.ii
  - i) D.2.q
  - j) E.1.q.i, ii
  - k) E.2.h.ii, iii, v
  - p) E.2.K
  - m) E.2.l
  - n) E.2.m
  - o) E.3.f
- 5) The project is proposing to utilize subsurface disposal fields for the new construction. Additional information about the design and sizing of the disposal fields is needed to verify the adequacy of the area for this purpose. Soils information should be provided to indicate percolation rates. The location of any wells currently used for potable water within 200' of the proposed system should be identified. Approval by NYSDEC will be required.
- 6) The project is proposing a water main extension from Doelner Circle through a paper street adjacent to the lands of the applicant. Pressure and flow should be verified on Doelner Circle to ensure adequate pressure existing for the project. The existing buildings on site should be connected to the new main as well. Provisions for metering water will require coordination with the Water Department.
- 7) The applicant's calculation of water and sewer usage should be provided and include provisions for the facilities in the Village Center.
- 8) Final location of the fire hydrants should be coordinated with the Fire Department. An additional hydrant should be extended to the end of Appletree Lane through the paper street adjoining the parcel at that location.
- 9) A north arrow should be added to all plan sheets.
- 10) Site coverage statistics and a parking analysis, of all facilities on site given their respective time of use, should be submitted and added to the plan.

- 11) Street addresses should be added to the adjoining properties for clarity and the subdivision lot designations removed.
- 12) The applicant has provided visual assessment information from the viewpoint of a residence on Doelner Circle and has proposed understory plantings to assist in screening the proposed project. Similar plantings were shown along the rear of the homes on Oakwood Street, however, the distance between the proposed two-story residential buildings and the homes on Oakwood Street is less than the distance to the homes on Doelner Circle and less of the existing tree line will remain. As such the applicant should consider and discuss the following options:
  - a) Eliminating the easterly portion of the proposed loop road to allow retaining more of the existing trees.
  - b) Additional screening techniques.
  - c) A combination of the above.
- 13) A proposed grading plan with limits of disturbance should be submitted for the entire site.
- 14) The height of all structures should be noted on the plans.
- 15) The three (3) car garage on the northeast corner of the loop road should be relocated away from the property line.
- 16) The landscaping plan for site should be developed to indicate how interior landscaping will be used to screen and/or soften the views from adjacent properties and include the number and size of the species to be planted.
- 17) Additional detail is needed on the sizing of the stormwater facility and the ability to infiltrate stormwater during winter months. This should include information regarding soils and depth to ground water. In addition, information regarding the size and capacity of the storm sewer on Doelner Circle is needed.
- 18) The applicant has indicated that porous pavement will be utilized. These areas should be denoted on the plan.
- 19) A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is needed and a Notice of Intent (NOI) will be required.
- 20) The surface treatment of the proposed walking path should be identified.
- 21) Location and type of all exterior lighting should be identified, including building mounted lighting. Lighting should be kept to minimal heights and full cut off, down lighting should be used.
- 22) Consideration should be given to moving dumpster locations away from the building. In addition, adequate space in the enclosures should be provided for recycling. The applicant should verify that no outdoor storage is proposed.
- 23) Provisions for US mail and package delivery should be described or shown.
- 24) The project is providing access at two (2) points. The fire department and Bruen Rescue should be contacted for comments regarding emergency access.

- 25) The applicants have indicated that this will be an age restricted facility. The age restriction policies and rental plan for various ages (65 vs. 55) should be documented by the applicant in writing and submitted as part of the application.
- 26) the location of the Town Boundary should be shown.
- 27) The traffic study focuses on vehicle trip generation from the proposed units and the impact on the level of service. Based upon the analysis there are no level of service impacts at either Pheasant Lane and Brookview Road, or Routes 9/20 and Middlesex Road. The applicant's traffic engineer should also comment on any deficiencies in the streets immediately adjoining the project and sight distances from and at the proposed driveway entrances. This should include a discussion on larger vehicles and events at the proposed facilities, as well.

#### **SUBDIVISION /LOT**

David Schuurman  
757 Co. Rte.7  
Proposed Lot Line

2013-37/RA/190.1-9-9

David Schuurman, applicant was present for this meeting. Mr. Elliott was present for his wife Cindy Elliott the land surveyor who was attending another meeting in a different town.

Mr. Elliott stated they are presenting a lot line adjustment between Mr. Schuurman and the St. Stephens Lutheran church. It is an equal land swap between the two entities exactly 4192 tenths of an acres. The Purpose of the land swap is for lot line setbacks for a new building.

Chairwoman asked for a rep from the St. Stephens Lutheran Church.

Charlie Mayrer is speaking for the church; he is on the church council. Noted that he is the husband of the Planning Boards Chairwoman Denise Mayrer who does not have any affiliation with the church.

Mr. Mayrer stated the applicant David Schuurman contacted the church during a council meeting and requested a boundary line adjustment so he could meet his setback requirements for the house that he is building. The church agreed to the land swap but they need Synod and state approval for the church to continue with the agreement of the land swap. All this is pending on the planning board approval.

Chairwoman Mayrer asked if the map is going to stand the way it is or is there a new map being submitted for signing.

Mr. Mayrer stated the current line he would like moved behind the current Sunday school and extend it from there, this will not change the acreage it will still be an equal swap.

Chairwoman Mayrer stated the only way we could do this is contingently on the Synod and state approval and the proper maps are submitted.

Mr. Johnson stated the lot line to be removed is the dotted line that goes horizontally and do the same for the vertical line that goes along side of the church because that is also going to be removed.

The applicant agreed

### **LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT**

Johnson moved, LaVoie seconded that the lot-line adjustment be accepted and approved. A public hearing is not required. The property will be conveyed to the adjacent landowner and become part of that existing parcel.

Contingent on the following

1 - a proper map

2 - proper authorization from the Synod and the state.

6 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Church, D'Angelo, Johnson, LaVoie, Mayrer, Puccio

Oppose: None

### **Recommend to ZBA**

Lisa Trubitt

Z717-13/RA/188.-5-21

1297 Schodack Valley Rd

Proposed - Area Variance

Mr. and Mrs. Trubitt, applicants were present for this meeting.

Chairwoman Mayrer asked the applicant to explain what it is they are looking to do.

Mr. Trubitt stated they are looking to replace their current garage that is 22 ft. by 18 ft. with a larger detached garage that will be 30 ft. by 34 ft. and to do that they need an area variance for the extra 1.25 % coverage. Meaning currently the allowed coverage is 10% they are looking at 11.25%.

Chairwoman Mayrer asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

There were no questions or comments for the applicant.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ZBA**

Puccio moved, LaVoie seconded a **"FAVORABLE"** **"recommendation"** to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

6 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: Church, D'Angelo, Johnson, LaVoie, Mayrer, Puccio

Oppose: None

#### **ADJOURN**

LaVoie moved, Church seconded that the Planning Board meeting be adjourned. There being no objections, Chairwoman Mayrer adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Nadine Fuda  
Director of Planning & Zoning