

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

PLANNING BOARD

ROCCO FERRARO
Chairman

PAUL PELAGALLI
Attorney

MARGARET SPRINGLI
Secretary



MEMBERS
Emad Andarawis
Michael Hale
Joel Koval
Eric Ophardt
Kim Paulsen
Tom Werner
(alternate) Eric Prescott

Planning Board Meeting Minutes

January 14, 2014

Those present at the January 14, 2014 Planning Board Meeting were:

Planning Board: R. Ferraro, Chairman, E. Andarawis, M. Hale, J. Koval, E. Ophardt, T. Werner
E. Prescott – Alternate Member

Those absent were: K. Paulsen

Those also present were: J. Scavo, Director of Planning
W. Newman, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C.
P. Pelagalli, Counsel
M. Springli, Secretary

Mr. Ferraro, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:04pm. All in attendance stood for the Pledge of Allegiance. The chairman then reviewed those members whose terms had been reinstated and noted that Eric Prescott would be a voting member for the evening's proceedings in the absence of Kim Paulsen.

Minutes Approval

Mr. Koval moved, seconded by Mr. Andarawis, to approve the minutes of the meeting on December 10, 2013 as written. Ayes: Ophardt, Andarawis, Prescott, Koval, Hale, Werner. Noes: None.

Public Hearings: NONE

Old Business

[2013-020] Trojanski Builders - Proposed (10) lot residential subdivision to be known as Diamond Pointe, Clifton Park Center Road, Preliminary review and possible determination. SBL(s):271.19-2-4, 271.-4-29.2

Mr. Ferraro explained that two primary issues were being addressed for this project at this time, the first being a subdivision of the Lands of Phillips, and the second, with one of the newly created lots to be made part of the new 10-lot subdivision within a R-1 residential district. The chairman remarked that a negative declaration pursuant to SEQR was issued at the December 10th, 2013 meeting when the project was last seen at a public hearing. Mr. Ferraro added that Board would allow additional comments at this meeting from the public even though the public hearing has been closed.

Mr. Gavin Vuillaume, with Environmental Design Partnership, presented the project, a 10-lot subdivision on 7+ acres. Mr. Vuillaume reminded the Planning Board members that most discussion at the last hearing was centered on drainage and traffic concerns. The consultant stated that there would be minimal impact from this subdivision and added that a cluster mailbox will be placed in the subdivision according to new US Postal Service requests. Mr. Vuillaume also noted that stormwater management features on the project have been slightly modified based on comments made at the previous meeting and professional review, stating that the sheet flow on the western slope of what is tentatively called Emerald Terrace has been reduced and implementation of a crown design will now ensure that flow occurs on both sides of the road to reduce the potential for large areas of freezing on any one side of the road. It was further stated that the applicant would prefer not to fence in the stormwater area as it is designed to be dry between events, but it could be stipulated that the builder would add such fencing later in the buildout period if it is deemed necessary by the town. Mr. Vuillaume mentioned that a cultural resource study was done by an archaeological consultant and no issues of significance were found noting that the subsequent report has been filed with the proper office at the State, and the consultant noted that he was awaiting a response letter to add to the project file.

Staff Comments:

Environmental Conservation Commission

The ECC held a meeting on January 3, 2014 to discuss the project and issued a comment letter on 1/7/2014 stating that their concerns had been addressed and had no further comments.

Fire Prevention

Sheryl Reed issued a memo dated 1/3/2014 with the following comment:

- 1) Provide Postal Verification and proposed street name.

Building and Development

Steve Myers issued a memo dated 12/31/2013 with the following comments:

- I disagree with the interpretation of EDP that a SWPPP is not required. The permit requirements state that a SWPPP is required for disturbances over one acre that discharges to the surface waters of the State. The claim that the disturbance does not exceed five acres removes the need for a SWPPP is incorrect. The permit authorizes discharges from construction activities to the surface waters of the state. All projects have that potential
- If the stormwater practices are to be owned by the Town following completion of the project, the design engineers cannot dictate maintenance procedures to the Town.
- If the project does not require post construction stormwater practices as claimed, how can the engineer include a schedule of required maintenance in the stormwater management narrative?
- Since it appears a SWPPP is required discussion of the required green infrastructure should occur with the next submission.

Open Space, Trails and Riverfront Committee

Dan Hartnett sent a memo dated 1/14/2014 with the following comments:

We appreciate the applicant providing a 10' easement to the town for a future trail, but repeat our comments from multiple prior planning board meetings that this easement must be 15', current multi-use trunk trails, as Clifton Park Center Road would be classified are 10' wide, so a 10' wide easement would not accommodate a future trail. We request the applicant provide a 15' ROW.

Mr. Scavo responded to Mr. Hartnett's request that the proposed 10' would be added to the existing 10' from the edge of the pavement so only 10' additional should be adequate for any future trail.

Planning

John Scavo offered the following:

Prior comments noted on 12/10/13 still need to be addressed as noted in a review letter dated 1/3/2014. Mr. Scavo also stated that the stormwater issues presented by Steve Myers have been satisfied based on conversations between the consultant and the town designated engineer since that letter was written on 12/31/2013.

New Comments

1. It should be noted on the Plan that "1. The Town of Clifton Park is not responsible for the snow removal in front of and around the cluster mailbox." "2. It shall be the responsibility of the either the homeowners association or the property owners within the subdivision to clear and maintain the area around the cluster mailbox for postal deliveries." "3. The Town of Clifton Park is neither the owner of nor responsible for the designated cluster mailbox, mounted post, and concrete pad."
2. Sheet 5 of 10 – Paved Specifications & Utility Layout Detail – Note six should be eliminated. Geotextile fabric for the sub-base is a requirement of the town and shall not be

optional.

3. A notation should be added to the plan which states, "No further subdivision is allowed".

Professional Comment:

Wade Newman, MJ Engineering, stated that since issuing a January 9th comment letter, the design consultant and developer had satisfied most of the existing concerns. Mr. Newman did seek to clarify that sump pumps were still being proposed and Mr. Vuillaume reaffirmed that they were and stated that extra dry wells were added as well. Mr. Vuillaume also confirmed that, if needed, easements would be acquired and signed before stamping of the plan, but it did appear as if there may not be a need as the developer may be able to do a direct bore for utilities within the existing right of way. Mr. Vuillaume added that the future maintenance of utilities will be within the right of way and he will be discuss the plan with CPWA to make sure they feel it is adequate. Mr. Ferraro then asked that it be required that the applicant would identify any easements needed for future maintenance prior to stamping.

Public Comment:

Karen Millard, 478A Moe Road, described her house as being behind the proposed project. The resident expressed concern with keeping as many trees as possible on the proposed project and stated that without them she felt it would be an invitation to trespassers to cut through her yard to get to the public library. Ms. Millard stated that she had had a conversation directly with Mr. Trojanski who mentioned that he could put some extra trees or shrubs up as a barrier. Ms. Millard also remarked that she did not feel she had any other options. The chairman then responded that she always has the option to add a fence on her own property.

Chris Semenza, Semenza Homes, has developed the subdivision of 537A and B Clifton Park Center Road and stated that he had to provide 25' no cut buffer zone and asks that same be done for this project.

Members of the Planning Board then clarified that those neighboring lots were keyhole lots.

Karen Millard also asked for 25 foot no-cut buffer

Dale Gleason, resident of 539 Clifton Park Center Road, stated that her property is adjacent to the Lands of Phillips which is proposed to be added to the northeast corner of Diamond Pointe. She asked to see how close the lot is to her property on the aerial map and added that she would also request a 25' no-cut buffer.

The Planning Director stated that keyhole lots require special legislation per Section 208-86 in the R-1 zone vs. the conventional subdivision and that it was a requirement in Town Code that larger setbacks and a landscaped buffer be provided for keyhole lots while this subdivision is being proposed as of right in a residential R-1 zone according to Town Code.

Mr. Koval observed that the limits of clearing look to be about 40-50 ft. on lots 7 and 8. Mr. Ferraro asked if the limits could be less for initial clearing for Lot 6. Mr. Vuillaume stated that it should not be a permanent buffer or homeowner will not have a usable backyard. Mr.

Ferraro remarked that on Sheet 4 of 10, Lot 5 should be referenced instead of Lot 6 for the habitat area.

Mr. Werner asked whether the species of plants in the habitat area would be a maintenance requirement of a future homeowner. Mr. Vuillaume stated that it would be in the deed for the homeowner to maintain the fence but not the plant and that it would be the homeowner's responsibility, instead of the town's or developer's.

The chairman asked for clarification on the fencing around the stormwater management area and Mr. Scavo said that it appeared that it should be dry most of the time, but that if it ended up being filled with standing water during the buildout phase, the builder would fence it then if the town deemed necessary. Mr. Koval and Mr. Hale stated that unless a real safety issue, they would rather not see a fence. The Board generally appeared to concur.

Mr. Scavo remarked that the Clifton Knolls Park District should be noted on plan.

The Chairman asked if there were any other issues or concerns. The board seemed satisfied with the progress of the project, asking that any easements be verified before stamping. Mr. Ferraro noted that the public hearing had been closed and SEQR determination had been made.

Mr. Werner offered Resolution #1 of 2014, seconded by Mr. Ophardt, to waive the final hearing for this application for the (2) lot subdivision of the Lands of Phillips, and to grant preliminary and final subdivision approval condition upon satisfaction of all comments provided by the Planning Department, Town Designated Engineer, and all items listened in the final comment letter issued by the Planning Department. Ayes: Mr. Prescott, Mr. Hale, Mr. Werner, Mr. Koval, Mr. Ophardt, Mr. Andarawis, Mr. Ferraro. Noes: None.

Mr. Andarawis offered Resolution #2 of 2014, seconded by Mr. Hale, to waive the final hearing for this application for a (10) lot subdivision to be known as Diamond Pointe, and to grant preliminary and final subdivision approval condition upon satisfaction of all comments provided by the Planning Department, Town Designated Engineer, and all items listened in the final comment letter issued by the Planning Department. Ayes: Mr. Prescott, Mr. Hale, Mr. Werner, Mr. Koval, Mr. Ophardt, Mr. Andarawis, Mr. Ferraro. Noes: None.

[2013-038] Bobrick Expansion - Proposed 24,000 sf manufacturing/warehouse addition.
200 Commerce Dr., Preliminary review and possible determination
SBL(s):259.-2-93

Tom Andress, ABD Engineering presented the project located at 200 Commerce Drive in an L-2 Zone which was last seen on 11/26/2013. Mr. Andress stated that no significant changes had been made to the plan since the concept was introduced. It was noted that the applicant is trying to expand their building in order to maintain their competitive position in an expanding international market, but that shipping and truck traffic should not increase. Mr. Andress added that stormwater management will use infiltration practices as the soil at the location is very sandy. The consultant also stated that fire department access is adequate around the building but he met

with the Chief Fire Officer and the Building Director and it was decided an extra hydrant should be placed on site and will be noted on the plan. Mr. Andress stated that blue lupine was not recently found in the area but the previously designated preserved area will remain as it has been without change. Mr. Andress then noted that he had addressed the concerns from a review letter submitted by MJ Engineering and Land Surveyors in his most recent site plan for snow removal and stormwater overflow capacities and will meet with the town designated engineer to discuss any further details.

Environmental Conservation Commission

The ECC held a meeting on January 3, 2014 to discuss the project and issued a comment letter on 1/7/2014 stating that their concerns had been addressed and had no further comments.

Fire Prevention

Sheryl Reed issued a memo dated 1/3/2014 with the following comment:

- 1) Add a fire hydrant along the SouthEast corner of the building.

Building and Development

Steve Myers issued a memo dated 12/31/2013 with the following comments:

- All comments from last review appear to have been addressed.

Open Space, Trails and Riverfront Committee

Dan Hartnett sent a memo dated 1/14/2014 with the following comments:

No further comments at this time.

Planning

John Scavo asked for the following:

1. Add a note on the plan which states, "The emergency access drive shall be designed in accordance with the standards established in the New York State Uniform Building and Fire code."
2. The proposed building mounted lighting will be verified by Planning Staff prior to a certificate of occupancy being issued by the Building Department. The applicant should be aware that the proposed exterior lighting should not be modified from the approved plan without first obtaining written permission from the Town of Clifton Park.
3. The applicant should be aware that the required plantings must be completed prior to the Planning Board granting authorization for the Certificate of Occupancy to be released on the building addition.

Professional Comment:

Town Designated Engineer:

From a review letter dated 1/9/2014

Based upon our second review of the above documents, we offer the following comments for consideration;

State Environmental Quality Review

1. No additional comment

Short Environmental Assessment Form

2. Under Part 1.2, please add the NYSDEC for permit coverage under GP-0-10-001.
3. Under Part 1.3.a, the total acreage listed to be disturbed is 1.2 acres, where the Site Plan states 1.48 acres. Please clarify.

Site Plans

4. Provide material specifications and depth of gravel for the proposed gravel emergency access road to ensure it will be adequate to support the imposed load of a 75,000 lb emergency vehicle.
5. Protective bollards should be placed at the southwest corner of the building due to its proximity to the emergency access road.
6. The site plan notes a winged curb adjacent to the new stormwater basin, just north of the existing building, but the contours do not show this and indicate surface runoff from the new road will enter this basin. If this is the case, then this basin must include water quality controls, contrary to what the Stormwater Management Summary states.
7. The proposed additional for the compressor equipment appears to discharge runoff into subcatchment A and the adjacent stormwater basin. Similar to Comment 6, if this is the case then the stormwater basin must include water quality controls.
8. The stormwater report does not specifically identify what type of stormwater practice is being proposed on the northwest side of the building (i.e. identify by number per the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual). It is assumed that the infiltration system selected is an I-2, Infiltration Basin.

Under this assumption, the following comments are offered:

- a. The proposed infiltration practice appears to be within 25-feet of the proposed addition. Section 6.1.3 of the NYSSMDM requires infiltration practices to be setback 25-feet down-gradient from structures.
- b. The plans need to include notation that all upstream areas that will be contributing runoff to the infiltration practice are to be completed and stabilized before connection to the downstream practice pursuant to Section 6.3.5 of the NYSSMDM.
- c. The plans need to include notation that the infiltration facility shall not be used as a sediment control device during construction pursuant to Section 6.3.6 of the NYSSMDM. Due to this, the plans need to note the location of any required temporary sediment traps.
- d. There are no means for dewatering the infiltration practice as required by Section 6.3.6 of the NYSSMDM and need to be included.
- e. There needs to be design considerations for cold climate operation pursuant to Section 6.3.7 of the NYSSMDM and may include an underdrain system and/or valve controls.
9. An owner of a post-construction stormwater management practice, including the runoff reduction practices and SMPs included in the NYSSMDM, shall erect or post, in the immediate vicinity of the stormwater management practice, a conspicuous and legible sign of not less than 18 inches by 24 inches with the appropriate information as noted in Section 3.5 of the NYSSMDM.
10. The Outlet Control Detail requires additional information as follows:
 - a. Bedding requirements
 - b. Wall, base thickness and internal dimensions of structure
 - c. Pipe connection (booted or grouted).

Stormwater Management Summary

11. The report notes what appears to be assumed infiltration rates. In-situ infiltration rates are required pursuant to Section 6.3.1 of the NYSSMDM.
12. There needs to be confirmation of the depth to groundwater as the bottom of the infiltration practices are required to have three feet of vertical separation from seasonally high water table or bedrock layer, as documented by on-site soil testing pursuant to Section 6.3.1 of the NYSSMDM.
13. With respect to green infrastructure elements, while it appears that the minimum RRv is being provided, it is still required that the an analysis be conducted of all available practices with indication as to why each may not be viable with the overall goal of achieving 100% RRv.
14. There is no mention of soil restoration within the report and whether it is required based upon the existing soils and associated improvements.
15. Provide calculation demonstrating that the proposed infiltration practice will dewater the entire WQv within 48 hours as required by Section 6.3.2 of the NYSSMDM.
16. Provide calculation indicating that the minimum pretreatment volume is being provided prior to entry to the infiltration facility as required by Section 6.3.3 of the NYSSMDM. The minimum pretreatment will be dictated by the in-situ infiltration rates.
17. The report lacks a majority of the required background data required for a SWPPP as outlined in General Permit GP-0-10-001 and Section 208-115(D) of the Town Code. This information must be provided for review.
18. The on-site stormwater facilities will be privately owned and operated. Therefore, the applicant will need to execute a Town of Clifton Park Maintenance Agreement.

Wade Newman, MJ Engineering, stated that since Mr. Bianchi issued the preceding January 9th comment letter, the applicant has all comments addressed except the last and that Mr. Address stated that he will submit a revised SWPPP. Mr. Newman asked that results from tests which be submitted as well.

Public Comment: None

Planning Board:

Tom Werner asked what type of equipment was manufactured at the site and Mr. Bobrick stated that it was partitions, grab bars and hand dryers.

Mr. Hale remarked that it is noted that the existing habitat area is not to be disturbed. Mr. Scavo said not being an expert, he did reach out to the DEC, but it is correct that no disturbance is proposed in that area with this expansion.

Mr. Ferraro asked what the difficulty was with the SWPPP. Mr. Address replied that it was fully done even though he felt it was not required since there would be no discharge from site, but if Mr. Myers requested it, they would have the full NOI and will submit it for review anyway.

Mr. Ferraro stated it could be conditionally approved based on concurrence of the Town Designated Engineer and professional staff. The chairman added that if the TDE and staff did not find the conditions acceptable, then the applicant would be required to reappear before the Planning Board.

Mr. Hale moved, seconded by Mr. Hale, to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, an unlisted action, and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA. The motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Werner moved, seconded by Mr. Ophardt, to grant preliminary and final site plan approval to this application conditioned upon satisfaction of a SWPPP review by the town designated engineer and the Stormwater Management Officer as well as all items listed in the final comment letter issued by the Planning Department. The motion was unanimously carried.

New Business

[2014-002] **511 Clifton Park Center Road Daycare** - Proposed daycare facility in existing building previously operated by YMCA with prior SUP, 511 Clifton Park Center Road, Conceptual Site Plan Review, SBL(s): 271.19-1-63

Duane Rabideau, a consultant with Van Guilder and Associates, represented the applicant MK2CSWAG. Mr. Rabideau explained that the building had been a residence built in 1984, then became a daycare center in 1985 and between 1997 and 2007, it was owned and operated by the Southern Saratoga YMCA, but it is been vacant since then. He further added that the applicants moved next door in 2011 and subsequently purchased this corner property in 2012. Mr. Rabideau noted that maintenance to the property has been performed although there has been no change in the footprint. It was stated that the proposed daycare would be occupied by 16 students and 2 employees and that existing parking would be adequate with traffic entering at the eastern entrance and exiting on the western. Mr. Rabideau explained that school buses would drop off on the road not in the driveway. Furthermore, a sign would be proposed within the existing landscaped area. Finally, Mr. Rabideau noted that a lot line adjustment is also proposed to add the current recreational area to the adjacent residence noting that this area is almost entirely wetlands.

Environmental Conservation Commission

The ECC held a meeting on January 3, 2014 to discuss the project and issued a comment letter on 1/7/2014 stating these recommendations:

1. ECC proposes that the applicant install a visual delineation (e.g., signage) on the existing fence to indicate a DEC wetland.
2. The Applicant should locate the exterior waste receptacles out of view from high use thoroughfares.

Fire Prevention

Sheryl Reed issued a memo dated 1/3/2014 with the following comment:
No comment at this time.

Building and Development

Steve Myers issued a memo dated 12/31/2013 with the following comments:

- Applicant wishes to re-open building as a daycare previously approved per SUP in 1984. Facility has been inactive since 2007.

- Lot line adjustment appears to be proposed as well. Unsure if this will be a separate action or part of the SUP.
- Lot line adjustment will eliminate most of the play area for the daycare and the original SUP is very specific about no children in front yard. Entire area being transferred to the Ferguson property is in the wetland buffer and unbuildable. It can be used as a recreation area as it is currently.
- New parking configuration is proposed and should require variance unless planning feels it is pre-existing non-conforming. Any expansion to the building will require a use variance since it does not meet the current setback requirements.

Open Space, Trails and Riverfront Committee

Dan Hartnett sent a memo dated 1/14/2014 with the following comments:

Given the proposed use of this parcel, the Trails Subcommittee recommends the installation of a bike rack and a trail connection with crosswalk to the Moe Road and Clifton Park Center Trails located across the street from this parcel. This would provide the daycare center with a safe connection to 2 elementary schools, the YMCA, Library, Shen Main Campus and 2 town parks, all within walking distances along these existing trails.

Planning

John Scavo suggested the following:

1. The project will require site plan approval and it is recommended that a new Special Use Permit (SUP) be issued for the parcel since the original SUP was issued in 1984 and site conditions have changed since the original approval. The lot line adjustment can be treated by town code as an administrative action, but for site plan purposes the Planning Board may want to provide input on the commutative impacts of the lot line adjustment in regards to the site plan and SUP.
2. The daycare facility will be required to meet NYS Office of Children and Family Services (OCFS) licensing requirements.
3. I would recommend one way traffic flow with directional signage through the semi-circular driveway for drop-off and pickup.
4. What is the proposed height of the chain link fence for the enclosed outdoor play area? This height should be verified with OCFS to ensure it meets their minimum requirements.
5. What are the current exterior lighting conditions of the site and is any additional exterior lighting proposed (building mounted and/or pole mounted)?
6. How many children will the facility service? Number of employees?
7. What are the hours of operation?
8. Is an area reserved for a free standing sign? If so, where and what are the proposed dimension? Due to limited site distance at the intersection a free standing sign should be discouraged in the front area adjacent to Moe Road.
9. A notation should be added to the plan which state no dumpster shall be allowed onsite without first obtaining site plan approval for such. Based on the current plan it appears curb-side wheeled trash receptacles will be utilized.
10. The Plan shows "End of Stockade Fence is 0.7' +/- South of the Line". Which appears to make the fence over the property boundary from Parcel B onto parcel A. The proposed lot

line adjustment could be modified to correct this issue. Also, as part of the lot line adjustment the applicant should verify that the existing fence on Parcel B is outside of the Town's Right-Of-Way.

Professional Comment:

Based on a review letter issued 1-9-2014, Wade Newman offered the following comments:

State Environmental Quality Review

1. Based upon our review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an "Unlisted" action, however there is a potential that given the limited scope of the proposal, it may be classified as a Type II action. Should the application be deemed a Type II action, nothing further is required. Should it be deemed an Unlisted action it may not be necessary to undergo a coordinated review as we find no other potential involved or interested parties under SEQRA.

Short Environmental Assessment Form

2. No comments

Site Plans

3. Confirm that the existing accessible parking space has the appropriate free standing sign designating it as an accessible space.
4. The application makes no mention on the number of employees. Should there be an increase from what was previously, there may be a need to verify that the number of existing parking spaces are adequate.
5. There should be indication as to whether full sized school buses will be dropping off or picking up kids. If that is the case, there may be limited spaces for maneuvering internal to the site and may also creating short term stacking of vehicles within the right of way.
6. It is suggested that the applicant discuss the planned means of entering and exiting of the site as there is a potential for vehicles conflicts with the eastern most site entrance as close as it is to the intersection of Moe Road and left turn lane on Clifton Park Center Road.

Public Comment: None

Planning Board:

Mr. Koval asked that applicant make sure they have enough room to fulfill state requirements for play areas for different ages if they proceed with the lot line adjustment which reduces the existing recreation area.

Mr. Pelagalli asked if this would really qualify as subdivision, and Mr. Scavo explained it could be an administrative action based on new code for Lot Line adjustments adopted by Town Board in 2012. Mr. Scavo explained that it might allow for an opportunity to reaffirm a new SUP which would require a public hearing and could include subdivision at the same time if necessary.

Mr. Ferraro asked if a variance was required and for landscaping around the parking area to be added since it is on corner. Then Mr. Werner suggested a crosswalk and noted that might be a heavy ask for the applicant and recommended that the Planning Board might refer the crosswalk location to the Highway Safety committee for review. Mr. Werner further stated that he liked the

one-way in and out entrance/exit for traffic flow. Planning Board members suggested that if there were enough room to have two cars exiting, with indications 1 left turn and 1 right turn, it might be desirable.

Planning board members seemed to find the plan generally acceptable.

Discussion Items – Mr. Ferraro reminded everyone that applications to attend the Saratoga County Planning and Zoning conference were to be submitted by the next day.

Mr. Koval moved, seconded by Mr. Werner to adjourn the meeting at 8:32pm. The motion was unanimously carried. The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on January 28, 2014.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret L. Springli
Secretary

Cc: Planning Board members, Planning Department, Supervisor, Assessor, Zoning Board, Department of Building and Development, Town Clerk, Town Board Members, Highway Superintendent, Town Attorneys, ECC, CPWA