

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING - JUNE 6, 2022
CALLED TO ORDER BY: CHAIRWOMAN DENISE MAYRER AT 7:00 p.m.**

PRESENT

**Denise Mayrer, Chairwoman
Wayne Johnson, P.E.
Lawrence D'Angelo
Stephanie Leonard
Attorney Craig Crist, Esq.
Richard Laberge, P.E. Planning Board Engineer
Melissa Knights, Assistant to the Planning Board**

MEMBERS ABSENT

**Andrew Aubin, P.E.
James Shaughnessy, P.E.
John LaVoie**

**APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT MINUTES OF THE — May 16, 2022 MEETING AS THE
OFFICIAL MINUTES**

Johnson moved, D'Angelo seconded that the minutes be approved as amended, as the official minutes of this meeting.

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer

Oppose: None

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

Public Hearing

Melissa Knights read the hearing notice(s) as published in the Troy Record:

Joseph Micheli published May 28, 2022

**Chairman Mayrer directed the affidavit(s) of publication be made part of the hearing
record(s).**

Public Hearing Opened at 7:04 p.m.

Public Hearing Closed at 7:09 p.m.

Joseph Micheli
Reno Road
Proposed - 2 Lot Subdivision

2022-12/RA/189.-7-12.24

Francis Bossolini, P.E. was present for this meeting.

Mr. Bossolini stated they are proposing one building lot out of a 60-acre parcel which is located on Rt. 150 & Reno Road which is on the northeast corner of the property where they are creating a 7.312 acres building lot.

Mr. Johnson asked about the 100-ft access off of Reno Road, that will be the primary access?

Mr. Bossolini stated there is an easement through the parcel for the senior housing, and the remaining lands will have primary access from that easement off of Rt. 150.

Mr. Johnson asked the board what is the frontage width for access to remaining lands.

Chairperson Mayrer stated it is 50 feet width for a flag lot and 200 feet for remaining lands.

Mr. Johnson stated this is not remaining lands it is for future development.

Close Public Hearing

D'Angelo moved; Johnson seconded that the Planning Board to close the Public Hearing
4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer

Oppose: None

Lead Agency

Johnson moved; DeAngelo seconded that the Planning Board declares itself as **lead agency**
and that this is a

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer

Oppose: None

TYPE II Action

D'Angelo moved; Johnson seconded to define this as a **Type II action**.

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer

Oppose: None

WHEREAS a formal application was submitted to the Planning Board on: May 23, 2022 for approval of a 2-lot subdivision entitled, **Joseph Micheli**, map prepared by: Francis J. Bossolini, PE on May 20, 2022 and

WHEREAS a public hearing was held on the subdivision application and plat at the Schodack Town Hall on Monday June 6, 2022 at 7p.m., and

WHEREAS the requirement of the subdivision regulations of the Town of Schodack have been met by said subdivision plat and application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the application of Joseph Michael be **APPROVED CONTINGENT UPON** submission of final maps, payment of fees and before building permits can be issued, permits to construct well and septic must be obtained from the Rensselaer County Health Department.

Johnson moved D'Angelo seconded, To **APPROVE THIS MINOR SUBDIVISION** Motion carried.

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer

Oppose: None

Recommendation to the ZBA

Guy & Casharon Nirstant

Z808-22/R20/189.1-11-10

51 Prestwick Drive

Proposed - Area Variance

Applicant was absent from this meeting.

Subdivision/ Lot Line

Lori & Todd_Seeberger

2022-14/RA/188.-7-8.111

2183 Jensis Road

Proposed - Lot Line Adj.

Cynthia Elliot, Land Surveyor, was present for this meeting.

Ms. Elliot stated the Seebergers own 2 parcels one is 19.70 acres which is shared ownership with Scott Seeberger and is vacant land and the second lot is Lori and Todd's house on 1.96 acres, they are looking to add 3.50 acres to their 1.96 acres with a lot line adjustment, bringing their total lot size to 5.46 acres, the vacant lot will then be decreased to 16.207 acres.

Mr. Johnson asked if the gas line easement is going to cause any problems for access for remaining lands.

Ms. Elliot stated no, she doesn't believe so.

Lead Agency:

D'Angelo moved; Johnson seconded that the Planning Board declares itself as **lead agency**
4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer,

Oppose: None

Johnson moved; Leonard seconded that the Planning Board to declare this application as a
Type II Action

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer,

Johnson moved, D'Angelo seconded that the **lot-line adjustment** be accepted and approved, **Upon the conditions that new maps be drawn up regarding the changes requested by the board and resubmit for signing.**

A public hearing is not required. The property will be conveyed to the adjacent landowner and become part of that existing parcel.

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer,

Oppose

Subdivision/ Lot Line

Richard Haupt & Brandon Cross

2022-15/RA/218.-7-1 & 218.-4-15

820 River Road & 854 River Road

Proposed - Lot Line Adj

Cynthia Elliot, Land Surveyor, was present for this meeting.

Ms. Elliot stated 820 River Road owned By Brandon Cross has a very small lot 80 ft. x 129 ' he wishes to purchase from his neighbor a 0.47 of an acre to be able to have a place to park his car, currently it is parked right on the road. there is an abandon house that is falling down, Mr. Cross plans on removing the home for safety reasons.

Mr. Johnson asked where is Mr. Cross's house.

Ms. Elliot stated it is on the land that he owns, and it is right on Rt. 9J.

Mr. Johnson stated the arrow for Mr. Cross's property is not enough to make it clear as to what is his and what he is getting.

Ms. Elliot stated she will fix the lines to make it more apparent.

Mr. Johnson spoke about the table in the middle of the map showing an increase to Mr. Haupt property when it should be a decrease. He starts with 28.06+ sold off less the 0.47 being added to the other property the total should be 27.59 acres not 32+ acres. And asked for an explanation.

Ms. Elliot stated the applicant Mr. Haupt 3 parcels, the property behind Mr. Cross has a land hook to Mr. Haupt 28 acres, and a 75-foot access from Rt 9J, both of these have different block numbers which puts them on different tax's maps. The county tax mapping department failed to add these two to his 28 acres. Which means that he was never charged taxes for these.

Mr. Johnson stated Mr. Haupt has one tax number for all his property

Ms. Elliot stated correct, but they never merged all the acreage involved when he acquired the other parcels.

Mr. Laberge asked how do be clearly indicate the error with the tax mapping department at the county, maybe a letter from you stating what you have found and what needs to be done to get the map correct and copy the town so it can be added to the file for future reference.

Ms. Elliot stated a letter letting them know what she found is the best way to go without surveying the entire 32 aces.

Lead Agency

Johnson moved; Leonard seconded that the Planning Board declares itself as **lead agency**.

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer,

Oppose: 0

D'Angelo moved; Johnson seconded that the Planning Board to declare this application as a

Type II Action

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer,

Oppose: 0

Johnson moved, D'Angelo 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.

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer,

Oppose: 0

Site Plan /Special Permit Site Plan Modification.

Dan Sterantino

2022-13/HC/189.-9-3.1

1930 US Rt. 9

Proposed - New 40x80 storage bldg.

Steve Hart, Hart Engineering and Dan Sterantino, applicant were present for this meeting.

Mr. Hart stated the applicant is looking to put a 40x80 cold storage building up behind his recruiting business, the building will hold his vehicles, display banners and things of that nature. There will be a 10-foot distance between the 2 building, there is an existing building on site that was used for storage that will be coming down.

Mr. D'Angelo asked if the 10 feet meet the fire code for separation.

Mr. Hart stated to his understanding yes, that is correct.

Mr. Sterantino stated he spoke to an architect, and he said 10 feet is what they need.

Mr. Hart stated they could currently confirm that.

Mr. Laberge stated the setback in the rear, what is required and what is it.

Mr. Hart states he needs to confirm that he didn't add it onto the map, Mr. Sterantino had some conversations with Gary the building inspector a couple of weeks ago and he showed him is book and there is no rear setbacks, and the decision was up to the planning board.

Mr. Laberge asked about the access to this building.

Mr. Hart stated there will be two garage doors in front of the building.

Mr. Sterantino that he would like to have a couple of man doors on the side.

Mr. Laberge asked what is currently in the back on the existing building.

Mr. Sterantino stated it is a small sidewalk and the air conditioner units.

Mr. Hart stated in the area for the 40x80 new construction, is currently a chain linked fenced in from the previous tenant. He will be staying within that fenced in area.

Mr. Johnson asked if he was planning to store any fluids for automotive work inside the structure.

Mr. Sterantino stated no it is just going to be storage for trade show displays and stuff like that. He is currently storing his stuff at the back of the old Fastenal shop, the business that is currently renting the space will now be taking over the entire building and he has to move out.

Mr. Laberge stated he is not sure if the 10 feet had to be an uninterrupted space for fire access.

Mr. Hart stated they would call the fire chief and ask what they would like to see in this area and if the 10 feet separation is significant.

Lead Agency

Johnson moved; D'Angelo seconded that the Planning Board declares itself as **lead agency** and that this is a **TYPE II Action**

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer,

Oppose: 0

Type II Action:

D'Angelo moved; Johnson seconded that the Planning Board to declare this application as a Type II Action

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer,

Oppose: 0

Special Permit

Leonard moved; Johnson seconded to Approve and Adopting the **Special Permit**

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer,

Oppose: 0

Site plan modification

Johnson moved; Leonard seconded to Approve and adopting the **site plan modification** condition on a letter from the Schodack Valley Fire Department on the distance between the two buildings, clarify the rear setback, correct zoning.

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer,

Oppose: 0

Jeremy Capone
1573 Columbia Tpke.
Proposed - Garage/ Auto & Marine shop

2022-11/HC/178.-12-2.1

Attorney Craig Crist recused himself from this application.

Jeremy Capone, applicant was present for this meeting.

Mr. Capone stated he would like to run the garage at the old L&M site.

Mr. Johnson asked the site plan.

Mr. Capone stated that was the existing site plan from the past renters. What he did was Draw a line showing the space he was looking to use. Which is a quarter of the space available. And he plans to have a new sign using the original signpost that is there. The previous tenant asked for 15 cars and that is more then he is looking to have.

Mr. Johnson asked if he could get 15 vehicles on the space he is looking to use.

Mr. Capone stated yes.

Mr. Johnson asked what happens to the remaining lands.

Mr. Capone stated it is just an empty field, if it was up to him, it would be mowed.

Mr. Johnson stated you're not going to have access to the other part of the property then.

Mr. Capone stated he wasn't going to use it.

Mrs. Leonard stated nothing is going to be stored on site, boats, cars, etc.

Mr. Capone stated he is not storing anything, it does him no good with them sitting around, he is here to make money.

Lead Agency & Type II Action:

D'Angelo moved; Johnson seconded that the Planning Board declares itself as **Lead Agency**
4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer,
Oppose: 0

TYPE II Action

Johnson moved; D'Angelo seconded that the Planning Board to declare this application as a Type II Action

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer,

Oppose: 0

Change in tenancy/Special Permit

Johnson moved; D'Angelo seconded **APPROVAL** of a **change in tenancy** at 1573 Columbia Tpke. **stipulating a total of 15 vehicles on site at one time, and to be able to reface the existing sign.**

4 Ayes. 0 Noes. Motion carried.

Ayes: D'Angelo, Johnson, Leonard, Mayrer,

Oppose: 0

Site Plan /Special Permit

KME Property Development

2022-3/HC1/189-10-40.12 &40.2 &41

1764 Columbia Tpk.

Proposed -Retail/storage/Restaurant

Steve Lucius, Bohler Engineering, Mike Carry, applicant were present for this meeting.

Mr. Lucius spoke about the Laberge letter dated May 11, 2022 (see below) they were able to respond to all the comments and resubmitted their design plans. They understand that a traffic study is required and that is underway, they also have submitted their plans to DOT and will be happy to incorporate their comment and any additional comments from this board into the new site plan. They just received a new letter dated June 1, 2022 (see below) and are currently working on addressing them, there is one comment they would like to discuss and that is parking for the warehouse, and if the board like then to land bank the parking should this have a change in use. Other than that, they are looking to see if they can go through the SEQR process and set up a public hearing.

Mr. Laberge spoke about the parking, a note on the plans state the board has the prerogative to approve the lesser use for parking. there is relative low parking needs for the self-storage, but at some point, if some other tenant occupied the building so there is need to plan for parking. he asked Mr. Lucius to go through the parking in the different areas of the site.

Mr. Lucius stated there is 3 different lots and they are broken out into

1. Front on Columbia Tpke. retail and restaurant for both buildings
2. Retail in the southeast corner

3. Retail in the front with the self-storage in the back

It is all calculated as if it was a shopping center, with 300 sq. ft. of area. If they went with parking for each building and units, it would increase especially for the two buildings in the front. And I know the board is looking to reduce the amount of parking spaces.

Mr. Laberge asked how the board wants to view this, as a shopping center or individual, should the use change it is unfair for someone to have to walk to the back part of the site. What he see's by the chart on the plans for lot 40.12 required parking is 186 and proposed parking is 49 and on lot 40,1 required parking is 32 and proposed is 57. He is not sure how this works out,

There was more discussion on the parking and what could be done to amend the amount of spaces needed.

Mr. D'Angelo asked if he owned the land to the west. Couldn't you reserve more of a buffer for parking in the location. Leave it as green space for future parking if needed.

Mr. Lucius stated yes, there is potential to land back that area for parking.

Mr. Laberge stated in his letter they are still waiting for DOT comments and to hear what they think about the traffic flow and use of the existing driveways. Also, they need to get information from the town board on the water and sewer extension. Do you have a cut and fill analysis?

Mr. Lucius stated it is going to be a cut and fill site and hope to have a better plan as they get phase 1 stated.

Mr. Johnson stated you may want to think of sidewalks from building to building is you are not going to have sharded parking. the access off of luster Terrace doesn't show parking spaces is that just an open paved area?

Mr. Lucius state correct this area is for people with truck to unload for the bottom area of the storage facility.

Mr. Johnson asked about the landscaping.

Mr. Lucius stated trees were shown along the front drive and in the rear of the site, they will be looking to add, and the phases continue to evolve.

Mrs. Leonard she is all in favor of plantings and helping to soften it up a little bit. For plowing purposes, she understands not wanting to put planting in islands.

Mr. Laberge stated to the board his review letter was more on the concept level, they did provide plans that are more of a preliminary nature.

Chairwoman Mayrer, stated the board is going to request they take into consideration the comments and changes, get back to Mr. Laberge for further review then we will set the public hearing.

Mrs. Leonard asked if the storage building was one big warehouse or individual units

Mr. Lucius stated it is individual units in a climate-controlled building.

All agree to have the applicant to come back at a later date when they are ready.

Laberge Letter Dated May 11, 2022

Re: *Concept Plan Review
Schodack Commons Shopping Center
SPB # 2022-03*

We are in receipt of a revised concept plan for the above referenced project dated April 12, 2022 entitled "Site Layout Plan, C-301" and offer the following comments:

- 1. The project requires the following Planning Board approvals:*
 - a) Minor Lot Line Adjustment;*
 - b) Special Use Permit under the water Quality Control Act (WQCA);*
 - c) Site Plan approval;*
- 2. A traffic report will be required; and*
- 3. A full SWPPP will be required.*
- 4. The applicant should contact NYSDOT for their comments. The comments should be shared with the Planning Board and our office regarding the access points onto the adjacent state highway and potential stormwater discharge(s) to their system.*
- 5. The project sits on three (3) proposed lots. As such, the Zoning Analysis Table should be broken down by lot. We note that there appears to be set back issues with the Phase 4 building due to the internal lot lines on the rear and side of the building.*
- 6. The applicant should demonstrate that there is adequate ability for trucks to navigate the site.*
- 7. Access to the rear of the Phase 4 building should be provided. The applicant should consider a paved lane connecting the main site driveway to the parking area.*

8. The area behind the Phase 3 building should be widened to provide adequate space for loading and unloading to the four proposed tenant spaces. In addition, the area should be marked "No Parking- Loading and Unloading Only".
9. The dumpster location behind the Phase 4 building should be relocated to avoid the refuse truck needing to back into the main driveway.
10. The reference to "concept spaces" and 9' x 18' spaces in the Zoning Analysis Table should be removed.
11. Easements and/or maintenance agreements will be needed between parcels for the following:
 - a) Storm water.
 - b) Access/egress.
 - c) Parking; and
 - d) Winter maintenance.
12. The applicant should review the Town sign code and confer with the Building Department regarding allowable signage and location of same for this three-lot proposal.
13. Landscaping islands should be incorporated into the parking lot for the Phase 3 building.

We recommend the applicant revise the concept plan for review by the Board prior to proceeding with preliminary design plans. The preliminary plans should include:

- a) A cut and fill analysis with the volume(s) of material to be imported or exported.*
- b) An analysis of the water and sewer volumes by phase; and*
- c) A landscape plan for the project.*

*Richard F. Laberge, P.E.
President*

RFL: cjb

*C: Kevin Cioffi, Applicant (via email only)
Tim Freitag, Bohler Engineering (via email only)*

Laberge Letter Dated June 1, 2022

***Re: 2nd Concept Plan Review
Schodack Commons Shopping Center
SPB # 2022-03***

We are in receipt of a response letter from Bohler Engineering dated May 18, 2022 and a revised project narrative of the same date, along with a set of plans and Stormwater Management Report for the above referenced project both dated May 17, 2022. We offer the following comments regarding the revised information as it pertains to the conceptual plan.

1. The project requires the following Planning Board approvals:
 - d) Minor Lot Line Adjustment;
 - e) Special Use Permit under the water Quality Control Act (WQCA);
 - f) Site Plan approval;
2. The project is not currently in a water or sewer district. The applicant should submit a request to the Town Board to extend the districts (CWD101 and SS6) with the volumes of water and wastewater identified.
3. A traffic report will be required.
4. The applicant should contact NYSDOT for their comments. The comments should be shared with the Planning Board and our office regarding the access points onto the adjacent state highway and potential stormwater discharge(s) to their system.
5. The Planning Board should weigh in on the applicability of the parking requirements as a shopping center versus the individual uses on each lot. A copy of §219-25 is enclosed for your convenience.
6. The square footage of the total floor area should be shown for the storage building. Parking requirements need to be considered by the Planning Board for this use. The Board may wish to consider requiring additional area to develop additional future parking for this building should it be redeveloped to a different use in the future.
7. Lauster Terrace is incorrectly identified as a "Town Road". It is owned by Rensselaer County and will require County Highway Department review and comment.
8. Easements and/or maintenance agreements will be needed between parcels for the following:
 - e) Storm water.
 - f) Access/egress.
 - g) Parking.
 - h) Winter maintenance; and
 - i) Utilities.
9. The applicant has indicated they will make sign applications separately. As such, the signs shown on the plans should be removed at this time.
10. Future landscaping plans should attempt to screen the rear of buildings and roof tops from views along NY Rt. 150. A planting easement on the extremely wide NY Rt. 150 right-of-way should be pursued for this purpose in key areas.

Stormwater Comments

11. the project should identify the site constraints that necessitate the need to employ the relaxed design criteria for a redevelopment project per New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual Chapter 9: Redevelopment Activity. The

design criteria of Chapter 9 should be utilized "...to balance between 1) maximizing improvements in site design that can reduce the impacts of stormwater runoff, and 2) providing a maximum level of on-site treatment that is feasible given the site constraints present where the redevelopment activities are occurring." Sufficient space and elevation appears to be present to allow designs to be in accordance with sizing criteria in Chapter 4.

- 12. Additional survey information is required to the northeast of the property to enable a review of potential impacts of stormwater discharges to this point as proposed.*
- 13. Additional sub-catchment areas should be added to the analysis to include the drainage outfall to the southeast of the project at the storm drainage system located in this corner of the project.*
- 14. The report should include multiple design summary tables to clarify the information presented in narrative form.*
- 15. Soil test pit and infiltration testing should be conducted at the elevations of proposed stormwater management systems. These locations and results (logs) should be included on the plans to demonstrate that infiltration will function as designed and maintain the minimum required three (3) foot separation between the bottom of the underdrain and seasonal high ground water.*
- 16. A full Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that includes the storm water management report and an Operation and Maintenance plan among other required items should be provided for review.*
- 17. A project phasing plan should be included to limit soils disturbing activities to under 5 acres at any one time.*

We recommend the applicant incorporate the above into their preliminary submission. The preliminary plans should include a cut and fill analysis with the volume(s) of material to be imported or exported.

*Richard F. Laberge, P.E.
President*

RFL: bnl

Enc.

*C: Kevin Cioffi, Applicant, w/enc. (via email only)
Tim Freitag, Bohler Engineering w/enc. (via email only)
Craig Crist, Esq., w/enc. (via email only)*

Site Plan /Special Permit

Van Hoesen Station

2021-24/PD3/189.-10-36

1735 Richwood Drive

Proposed - PD2 site plan -

Michael Vaillant P.E., Lansing Engineering & Morgan Ruthman applicant were present for this meeting.

Mr. Vaillant stated they are working through the process to address all the comments from the Laberge Group and with the goal in getting a SEQR determination and a referral to the town board for the rezoning of the parcel to a PD2. One of the main things they want to address are the changes to the plans, one item was the request to soften the density along the row of town houses, they did that by adding 3 - 2 family unit houses. Which leads to 3 town house builds with 6 units each then ultimately moving into 10 to 12 units buildings. So that soften the transition from the neighbors and the new tenants. The other item was the layout of the septic system if needed, to do this the development would have to be done in phasis, building 20 through 24 would not be built because the septic system would be placed in that area, that is until sewer was available for hooked up. Then they would be built. They also added some sidewalks that was requested at the last meeting. one sidewalk runs from the entrance to the development, another runs from Richwood Drive out to Rt.9 and a proposed future sidewalk along Rt. 9. The last item was the buffer behind the town house units next to the Richwood subdivision. They plan to install a 45 foot of natural area buffer and give the townhouses a 15-foot back yard.

Ms. Knights stated she received an email from a resident in Richwood Drive, which was handed to out to the board members, she is wanting to know if there would be a fence installed blocking them from the town house residents.

Mr. Ruthman stated they are not proposing a fence, but it is something they can look into. He also want to touch on the back and forth procedurally on where they are right now, and wants to confirm where they are right now, they are in the sketch plan review process and so have discussed the aspects of SEQR review involved with sketch plan review and that PD2 reg doesn't state that this process requires a SEQR, but the planning board interprets it to mean that which is fine, they are affirmingly requesting this evening that the planning board confirm that the application material are complete. This was requested previously, and the planning board stated wasn't comfortable doing so because it needed more information related to the onsite sanitary septic system.

Mr. Laberge stated the board does do SEQR before it makes any recommendation to the town board, the screening issue to him goes to the completed site plan. The screening may need more help before this goes to the town board. He asked if they wanted to describe what they plan for the screening.

Mr. Vaillant showed the board the photos they had taken from Julianne Drive curb towards the proposed town houses, one with out and one with the town house placed in the photos. (Copies of these photos were in the members packets) he took the photos to board member Mr. Johnson to explain the differences in the 4 photos.

Mr. Johnson asked if they got permission to take pictures from behind the houses. So you could show us what the property owners will be looking at out their back windows.

Mr. Vaillant stated they didn't ask the homeowners for permission to do that., the comment letter stated for them to be taken from the right-a-way.

Mr. Johnson stated there is so little showing from these photos that it is hard to tell what they will actually be seeing from their backyards. He mention several times for sidewalks to be installed around the parking lots in front of the building leading out to the main drive. he still doesn't see them on the plans. Also are the bump outs going to be landscaped.

Mr. Vaillant stated they will be developing a landscaping plan, but yes, they will be grass or landscaped.

Mr. Johnson stated it is a common thing to park your vehicle and walk to the sidewalk and go to your apartment, same as going to a store or restaurant.

Mr. Ruthman stated the building have one point of access and the sidewalks allow the residents to assess the apartments, this is basically laid out just like their apartment buildings in Bethlehem which has been in operation for 35 years without sidewalks between the buildings and hasn't been an issue. Also, each one of the court yards are connected to a poured sidewalk which goes around the site.

Mr. Johnson asked did you not update the sidewalks on the middle five buildings (22 - 24) because those will all go into parking spaces they don't go into an open space, its similar to a handicap access space.

Mr. Ruthman stated that is a good observation and he thinks Mr. Johnson is correct.

Mr. Laberge stated the other spaces in grey may also be handicap spaces as well.

Mr. Vaillant stated that is something they will look at as they get closer to the site plan approval.

Mr. D'Angelo stated he personally doesn't like the setbacks from residents of Julianne Drive, it is referenced residential/multi-family, but this is not a residential multifamily zone. He would like to see these moved quite a bit further back from those residents. And if you don't access to public sewer, he doesn't like to put that much concentration of wastewater into the ground water when all the residents are on wells.

Mr. Vaillant stated as for the septic they need to do more investigation and do some test pits to get a further handle on the soils in this area. He doesn't think that it would behave any differently than in terms of the ability of the septic to function.

Mr. D'Angelo stated that is a lot more wastewater than 50 homes in the adjacent development and they are spread out by half acre lots.

Mr. Ruthman stated those are good points, but they need to be able to identify the feasibility of on-site management (septic). But for us to have meaningful dialog on the access to municipal sanitary management they need to have this project referred to the town board.

Chairperson Mayrer stated our engineer has recommended that we receive a written response to the relative comments he has provided, once the board receives that then we move on as to whether to determine the application complete, so the next step can occur

MEMBER DISCUSSION

None

ADJOURN

Leonard moved; Johnson seconded that the Planning Board meeting be adjourned. There being no objections, Chairwoman Mayrer adjourned the meeting at 8:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Melissa Knights
Director of Planning & Zoning