

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

PLANNING BOARD

ROCCO FERRARO
Chairman

ROBERT WILCOX
Attorney

PAULA COOPER
Secretary



MEMBERS

Emad Andarawis
Eric Ophardt
Ram Lalukota
Andrew Neubauer
Denise Bagramian
Greg Szczesny

(alternate) Keith Martin

Planning Board Minutes
November 24th, 2020

Those present at the November 24th, 2020 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board: R. Ferraro, Chairman, E. Andarawis, R. Lalukota, A. Neubauer, E. Ophardt, G. Szczesny

Those absent were: D. Bagramian, Keith Martin – Alternate Member

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

Mr. Ferraro, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Ferraro stated that the Planning Board meeting for tonight is being held remotely due to the current health crisis and inability to hold large gatherings in one place.

Minutes Approval:

Mr. Szczesny moved, seconded by Mr. Andarawis, approval of the minutes of the November 10th, 2020 Planning Board meeting as written. The motion was unanimously carried.

Public Hearings:

2020-032 & 2020-031 Hubbs Road Active Solar Special Use Permit & Site Plan

Applicant proposes constructing 6.7 MW(DC) ground mounted solar energy facility that will use approximately 16,896 solar panels. The panels will be mounted on a system of steel posts and racks. Two concrete pads with the electrical equipment are located near the panels and will include inverters and transformers., Hubbs Rd, Zoned: CR, Status: PB Preliminary Review w/ Poss SEQRA & Project Determination

SBL: 258.-1-6.3

To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: Creighton Manning Applicant: Active Solar **Last Seen on: 10-14-20**

Mr. Ferraro explained the review and approval process to those present, stating that the Board was required to render a determination pursuant to SEQRA (State Environmental Quality Review Act) prior to conducting a public hearing on this application. He explained that the Planning Board would assume Lead Agency status for the project and issue a negative declaration as a “formality” which neither granted nor implied approval of the Site plan and special use permit application. Should it be determined that additional environmental review is required, SEQRA discussions will be reopened and a decision rendered when deemed appropriate.

Mr. Ophardt moved, second by Mr. Neubauer, to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, a Type I Action, and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA.

Mr. Ferraro, Chairman, called the public hearing to order at 7:14 p.m. The Secretary read the public notice as published in the Daily Gazette on November 14th, 2020.

Mr. Andarawis stated that he would like to disclose that he resides in proximity to this application but in no way would benefit from the approval or disapproval of this application. Mr. Andarawis stated he has in the past meetings been a part of the discussion. Mr. Scavo stated that he sees no issue or conflict based on the disclosure, with Mr. Andarawis participating in continued review of the applicant’s request for site plan and special use permit approvals.

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Frank McCleneghen – Active Solar – Mr. McCleneghen stated that there are changes made to the project since it was last seen. He said that the project has been reduced to 6.47 MW DC and the panels have been reduced to 16,178 to accommodate the screening of the solar arrays. He said that the setback from Hubbs Road has been pushed back to be between 380’-420’, he stated the northern setback is 180’, eastern setback is 70’, and the western setback is 515’. He stated that the solar array has been moved an additional 100’ north where previously shown from the road entry from Hubbs Road to provide better screening and that there is a hard bend in the access road to screen the utilities on the poles exiting the site to tie into the electrical grid. He stated that the poles that would be seen would not have heavy mechanicals on them but rather look like the other utility poles visible on Hubbs Road. Mr. McCleneghen stated that more screening has been added with two rows consisting of 25 pine trees offset at 20’ on-center located between the array and the existing mature tree line from Hubbs Road. Along the eastern property boundary there will be two rows consisting of 60 pine trees. He stated that the roadway leading into the site will be a 24’ wide gravel road, and there is .031 acres of wetland disturbance in which an Army Corp permit has been obtained. Mr. McCleneghen showed on the map presented via the Zoom screen the 3 access gates that would be sliding gates with Knox boxes to the site and stated there would be a 7’ fence surrounding the site. Mr. McCleneghen stated that this project would provide 1,000 homes with clean energy and the homeowners that sign up would receive a 10% discount on their utility bill. Mr. McCleneghen stated that the land will be leased by Active Solar and not purchased as to preserve the land for the future. Mr. McCleneghen stated that there were concerns brought up and certain changes were made. He stated that the solar array has been moved 100’ to the north to make it about 400’ from Hubbs Road, the road will bend to the west behind existing mature vegetation to remain, hiding the equipment poles, some poles were relocated, and that 25 trees were added to the southern boundary. Mr. McCleneghen stated that Board members were invited to walk the property and that some did to observe the screening and where the array would be located. Mr. McCleneghen stated an additional view shed study was done for the screening. He stated a blue tarp was put up to represent the limit of clearing and additional landscaping at their height and proximity to the roadways. He stated that this was to simulate a leaf off view and the first was done on Hubbs where there is a home across the street and that the blue tarp was only seen at a 600% zoom. He also showed 5 other points and stated that zoom was needed to see all of the blue tarps. Mr. McCleneghen stated that the utility poles would fit in the neighborhood as there are poles on Hubbs Road. Mr. McCleneghen showed on the Zoom screen other solar sites in Clifton Park and stated that they are not screened as well as this proposal is. Mr. McCleneghen stated that this is not a utility plant and that professional studies that he has investigated and sited have shown no decrease or increase in property value for surrounding neighbors. Mr. McCleneghen stated that after the initial construction period of about 4 months, there would be little traffic to the area. He stated that four times a year the array area would be landscaped or inspected, and that this would not create any more traffic than other

active construction sites. He stated traffic would be much less with the proposed use of community solar versus if it were developed with the permitted use of single family homes found in the CR Zoning District.

Mr. Tony Papa – land owner – Mr. Papa stated that he has seen much development over the years since his family has resided on the property. He stated that he does not want to sell the land, and that he understands the concerns of others. He would like the area to stay the way it is instead of possibly developing 28 single family homes as permitted by the zoning code.

Mr. Ferraro stated that there was a question in the chat comments that there was no notification to the public within 500' of this public meeting and that the project hearing should not proceed. Mr. Scavo stated that he has spoken with the Town Attorney and that notification of this project was sent out in August 2020 for preliminary consideration at a September 2020 Planning Board Meeting, and that the notification was transparent for the project and within town law and that the Planning Board should proceed. Mr. Scavo also stated that it was published in the Town's Official Newspaper.

Staff Comments:

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 11/16/20 stating:

- Fire truck used is still incorrect and affects turning radius
- Pull offs are still only 50' long
- Specify a Knox box or Knox lock for gate
- Specify road will be certified by an engineer as able to support 75,000 vehicle

Wade Schoenborn, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention:

1. Specify Fire Apparatus Access Road able to support a 75,000 lb vehicle
2. Provide an Emergency Vehicle Access plan that shows the Emergency Vehicle can stay on the access road.
3. Specify Fire Apparatus Pull Off every 500'
4. Add assigned 911 address of 35 Hubbs Road to the site plan
5. Specify the width of the Access Gate
6. Specify a Knox Box for the Access Gate

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 11/19/20 with the following comments:

1. All runoff from the post-development shall be treated prior to entering the wetlands. The post development runoff totals shall be equal or below the pre-development conditions.
2. Question 32a in the NOI is no. Therefore, the NOI cannot be processed. The SWPPP preparer must modify design to meet sizing criteria,

3. Provide documentation that addresses question 36a of the NOI where it states “Reduction of the total CPv is achieved on site through runoff reduction techniques or infiltration systems.
4. For the Post Construction SMP Identification the total contributing impervious acres for the infiltration basin and dry swale total 2.6 acres, where the total impervious area for the project is listed at 1.8 acres. Reduction practices cannot be counted twice.
5. In Appendix E, the use of Vegetated Swales is being calculated for the RRV, this is not shown in the NOI.

The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 11/17/20 and issued a memo recommending:

1. The ECC notes that the project may result in intrusion into the LC Zone. The applicant must file for an Application for Approval of Work to be Done in the LC Zone with the Town of Clifton Park.
2. The Planning Board should require a deed restriction which requires the applicant and/or lease holder to maintain all vegetative buffers throughout the life of the project.

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a letter dated 11/18/20 with recommendations he made:

1. A Decommission Plan dated November 2020 has been provided and submitted for review. Based on my review, it appears to meet the guidance offered by NYSERDA – NYS Solar Guidebook. Please add the following notation within the decommission plan:

Solar Energy Systems are considered abandoned after 12 months without electrical energy generation with distribution and must be removed from the property. Applications for an extension may be reviewed by the Clifton Park Planning Board for a period of 12 additional months.

This statement shall also be noted as a condition of the Special Use Permit that would trigger the implementation of the decommissioning plan for the removal of the ground mounted solar array.

2. The applicant should verify if the decommission dollar value estimate includes a 2.5% inflation rate as recommended by the Massachusetts Solar Market Decommissioning Costs Calculator.

Mr. Scavo stated that there have been many resident concerns about the use of a ground mounted solar array in this zoning. Mr. Scavo referred to Section 208-16 of the CR zoning code and the SUP as well.

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter dated 11/20/20 had the following comments:

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

1. No further comments.

SITE PLANS

2. At each pond, provide a warning signs must be posted prohibiting swimming, wading, and skating, warning of possible contamination or pollution of pond water, and indicating maximum depth of pond pursuant to Section 6.1.6 of the NYSSMDM.
3. Pursuant to Section 3.5 of the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual (NYSSMDM), the proposed stormwater practices need to have a conspicuous and legible sign posted. The plans need to provide the standard sign with the applicable language as well as the location for any modified new stormwater facilities.

DECOMMISSIONING PLANS

4. Section 5 indicates that the proposed current decommissioning value is \$95,000.00, however this does not appear to be consistent with other similar sized solar projects in this region. The amount deposited should equal the full value of the decommissioning plus additional funds added over a term to account for annual inflation, typically at 2.5%.

STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN

5. Section 5 of the SWPPP shall be updated to include the following information:
 - a. There shall be a general discussion of stormwater management planning undertaken with emphasis on items outlined in Section 5.3 (Table 5.7) of the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual (NYSSMDM). For Green Infrastructure practices, differentiate between those which are and are not being utilized to obtain the required WQv and RRv. If not being utilized, provide reasoning.
 - b. In Table 8, the minimum RRv does not match the RRv calculation sheet found in Appendix E, revise accordingly.
 - c. Since it appears the on-site stormwater management facilities will be privately owned, this shall be acknowledged in the SWPPP and a maintenance agreement and easement for access executed with the Town of Clifton Park will be required.
6. Question 4 of the NOI indicates that greater than 5 acres of disturbance will occur at one time, however the phasing plan provided shows less than 5 acres, please clarify.

7. The RRV provided does not satisfy the RRV required as indicated by your response to Item 32a of the NOI. Additional measures should be investigated to achieve full RRV.
8. NOI, Post Construction SMP Identification (starting on page 15 of 23) indicates Infiltration Basins (I-2) and Dry Swale (O-1) are being utilized for RRV reduction, however this is not consistent with the SWPPP text or plans, please clarify.
9. If the proposed ponds shown are being utilized as water quality controls, they should be designed per Chapter 6 of the NYSSWDM. Also please note that the Town prohibits the use of a P-5 practice and in the event it is determined that the P-5 practice is the only viable option, supporting materials will need to be submitted to the Town for review before it will be deemed acceptable for use. The applicant should meet with the Town's Stormwater Management Officer to review any proposed green infrastructure practices to avoid those that may be deemed undesirable.
10. The HydroCAD model indicates that pond DA3 will reach a maximum of height of 376.47 and pond DA7 will reach a maximum of height of 378.68 at the 100-year, 24-hour storm event. Both of these elevations are over the top of the perimeter berm hence do not provide any freeboard. There should be 12-inches of freeboard between the top of berm and flood elevation as a factor of safety.
11. Section 5.2 of the SWPPP indicates that the proposed project will increase the peak runoff in AP-1 during the 10 and 100 year storm. This condition is outside the tolerance allowed by NYSDEC of 5% of the pre-developed condition for the design storm as outlined in Chapter 4.
12. Due to the increase in runoff generated from the site under the 10 and 100-year events in Area AP-1, there needs to be a discussion as to whether a down stream analysis is required as noted in Section 4.10 of the NYSSMDM. The NYSSMDM indicates that a downstream analysis is warranted if peak flow rates increase by more than 5% of the pre-developed condition or no downstream structures or buildings are impacted.
13. Indicate the existing groundwater depth in the vicinity of the ponds to determine if an impermeable liner needs to be provided.
14. Pursuant to Section 6.1.6 of the NYSSMDM, maintenance access should extend to the forebay, safety bench, riser, and outlet and be designed to allow vehicles to turn around. The only maintenance access shown for the northwest pond does not reach the overflow.
15. Shows any proposed temporary sediment traps on the plans. The calculations shall state the required surface areas and depths of each sediment trap shown.

Mr. Ferraro asked if the technical comments can be addressed internally with Mr. Myers and Mr. Reese. Mr. Lippmann stated they can be.

Public Comments:

Helen Wilson – Ms. Wilson stated that according to town law that the notices to residents 500' to the project must be given notification 7 days prior but no more than 20 days and the law was not followed. She stated that the town's alert system is not working either and that this is mandatory, and she feels it is not being followed. Ms. Wilson stated that the setback given, even though pushed back should be more. She stated that she feels it should be 1,000' with the evergreen buffer for sufficient screenings. She stated that the access road is not very palatable and the look does not fit. She stated that a letter was submitted for the record about the views from the other properties and that value of the surrounding properties and that it would negatively impact her and her neighbors. She read a letter from Ms. Stolzenburg which stated the property values would decrease in the area due to a solar array. Ms. Wilson also stated that she feels that the decommissioning plan is inadequate and would violate town code.

Michael DeMeo – Mr. DeMeo stated that he has shared a link in the chat for NYSERDA for others to find out more information on solar energy. He also stated that he feels that the adjustments made to the plan are improvements and that he would be happy to tap into the energy when it becomes available.

Rosalie Masseria – Ms. Masseria stated that she agrees with Ms. Wilson's comments and that she is in disagreement with the location of this proposed solar farm and not with the use of solar as a source of energy. She questioned the board about on what merits an application like this would be denied and that it needs more in-depth review before being approved. She asked the Board about the walk through that was done and for the Board's opinions. Mr. Ferraro stated that this will be addressed in the Planning Board Discussion. Ms. Masseria asked what the next steps would be for this project. Mr. Ferraro stated the discussion among the Planning Board members for both the special use permit and site plan determinations will occur after the close of the public hearing and be based on the time frames the Planning Board is mandated to act within. Ms. Masseria stated that even if people cannot see the array from the ground it does not mean that the array is not there.

Dave Como – Mr. Como stated that he feels that it is easier to install a solar array farm than it is a pool in the town and that he does not understand the logic. He noted that when he installed an in-ground pool at his property he had to go through many more hoops than the solar has been required to do. He asked how many more feet the array would be pushed back. Mr. Ferraro stated that the clearing area is pushed back to 300 ft from Hubbs Road to accommodate the access road and the solar arrays will be an additional 100 ft. from Hubbs Road to about 400 ft. Mr. Ferraro stated that there will also be 2 rows of Pine Trees added along the portion of the access road

running parallel to Hubbs Road. Mr. McCleneghen stated that 25 evergreen trees, approximately 7-8 feet tall will be planted in dual at 20 ft. on center and a visual study was done to show how the trees provided a mitigated buffer. Mr. McCleneghen stated that the landscaping was turned to face Mr. Como's property to help better screen as well. Mr. Ferraro stated that the town code has allowances for a Special Use Permit (SUP) and that the Planning Board has responsibility to make conditions to the SUP with reasonable restrictions to not negatively impact other permitted uses within the zoning district.

Bill Dolland - 30 Hubbs Road – Mr. Dolland stated that he feels that he is closest to the panels and stated that he is happy with the site evaluation the modifications that the applicant made based on the Planning Board's review and comments. He said that he would like to see an agreement that for the life of the project, a maintenance agreement be made so that the plantings and buffering remain. Mr. Scavo stated that this can become a part of the conditions of approval if the Planning Board states such under their notice of decision.

Chris Rodecker – 34 Hubbs Road – Mr. Rodecker stated that he has concerns with the roadway. He stated that this area of the road people like to speed by and is dangerous. He stated that he has young children that get the school bus and get off at the end of his driveway that is close to the access road with larger vehicles and strange people going in and out. He asked if something could be done to help with the safety of his children for the four months the construction would be going on, or if the construction vehicles could enter and exit from Mr. Papa's property on Schauber Road. Mr. McCleneghen stated that signs would be put up for truck entering and exiting Hubbs Road, but using Mr. Papa's driveway would have to be acceptable to Mr. Papa and approved by the town. Mr. Scavo stated that if it is established as a temporary entrance then the town would most likely allow temporary access to the site via Schauber Road. Mr. Papa stated that for the safety of the children that he would allow the access. He said that this would not create any more disturbance as this is a driveway like road that he uses to drive his tractor to the rear of his property and it is also the same road that the Planning Board used to access the project site. Mr. Rodecker thanked Mr. Papa.

Ms. Lois New – Ms. New, an adjacent property owner at the intersection of Hubbs and Schauber Road stated that she feels that this is a good project and applauded the applicant on addressing the concerns of the residents.

Ms. Helen Wilson asked when the public would know if the project is approved. Mr. Scavo explained the steps that are taken to approve or deny any application. She asked if the access road would affect the SWPPP. Mr. Scavo stated it would be a minor modification that town staff can evaluate and that since it is already a roadway providing access to the site, its use as a temporary construction entrance should not pose a problem.

Ralph Savage – Mr. Savage stated he has sent a letter to the Town for the Board to review. Mr. Savage stated that he has concerns about the fact that this project is in a residential area and surrounded by residential homes. He stated that he has concerns about the areas being a beautiful natural open space and is now being developed. He also stated that he has seen studies on other areas and that the property value decreased by 7%.

Lydia Savage – Ms. Savage stated that her concerns with this property are including the impact on the environment and the trucks driving by with many different materials. Ms. Savage stated that she also has a concern with the dangers of a possible battery leak and a tree possibly falling and cracking the panels, letting chemicals leak into the ground. Mr. McCleneghen stated that the panels are made of glass on both sides and have no heavy metals and transformers are filled with natural oils. Ms. Savage also questioned why the Planning Board has allowed a property owner in Clifton Park to speak in the public hearing who doesn't live in Clifton Park.

Mr. DeMeo asked for clarification on the traffic to the site after the array is built. He thanked Mr. Papa for thinking of the safety of the community by allowing temporary access on Schaubert Road. Mr. McCleneghen stated that it is mowed 4 times per year.

There being no additional public comment, Mr. Ferraro moved, second by Mr. Szczesny, to close the public hearing at 8:46 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Lalukota stated that he was a part of one of the walks around the property and saw no visual impacts. Mr. Lalukota stated that he agrees with the ECC comments to maintain the buffer.

Mr. Ophardt asked the applicant if the access road could be moved permanently to Schaubert Road and bring the power lines around to Hubbs. Mr. Szczesny stated that he thinks it would be disturbing wetlands and increasing land disturbances. Mr. McCleneghen stated that the electrical circuit to connect to is on Hubbs Road and to move the energy around the corner to connect would not be cost effective, about \$500,000. Mr. McCleneghen stated that after the construction the traffic would almost go back to normal except for the few times a year that the site is maintained and inspected.

Mr. Ferraro asked if there would be a wildlife gap in the fencing. Mr. McCleneghen stated that there would be a 5" habitat gap. Mr. Ferraro stated he would like to see the decommissioning plan increase the annual amount to account for inflation over the years, and that this would be updated as stated by Mr. Scavo and Mr. Lippmann in their comments. Mr. McCleneghen stated that they are in the process of reviewing the estimate for inflation based on comments offered.

Mr. Szczesny stated that decommissioning plan seems low as compared to other project. Mr. Scavo stated that town professionals evaluate this and that there is the Massachusetts Solar Panel Calculator that is used as an estimating guide to find out the amount a plan should be. Mr. Szczesny stated that he appreciates the applicant on being accommodating and reflecting recommendations and design changes offered by the Board on the current site plan.

Mr. Ferraro stated that a comment was made in the chat that Ballston Lake would need to approve the plan. Mr. Ferraro stated that Ballston Lake is a Hamlet and that the town of Clifton Park oversees them and this application is solely in the town of Clifton Park. Mr. Ferraro stated he also did a field check and was pleased with the outcome of it including the applicant increasing the setback and adding the pine trees to help buffer the arrays.

Mr. Andarawis stated that he feels that the concerns that have been brought up over the meetings on this application have been accommodated and would like to see the buffer and maintenance of the buffer maintained and not cleared around the entire project including Schauber Road. Mr. McCleneghen stated that this is acceptable and can be added.

Mr. Szczesny offered Resolution No. 13 of 2020, seconded by Mr. Ophardt to waive the final hearing for this application for the Special Use Permit approval, and to grant preliminary and final subdivision approval conditioned upon satisfaction of all comments, provided by the Planning Department, Town Designated Engineer, and all items listed in the final comment letter issued by the Planning Department.

Conditions:

1. All technical and SWPPP comments are addressed.
2. Decommissioning plan to be reviewed by the Town and deemed satisfactory.
3. Temporary construction entrance will be on Schauber Road.
4. Vegetative buffer will be maintained and kept for the life of the project and reflected in the deed as represented on the site plan.

Roll Call:

D. Bagramian - Absent

E. Andarawis - Yes

E. Ophardt - Yes

A. Neubauer - Yes

G. Szczesny - Yes

R Ferraro - Yes

R. Lalukota – Yes

Keith Martin - Alternate Member - Absent

Ayes 6

Noes: 0

The resolution is carried.

Old Business:

2020-023 Stewart's 923 Riverview Road Site Plan

Applicant proposes redevelopment of the existing shop with a gasoline fuel island and car wash. The new store will be approximately 3,900 square feet, 923 Riverview Rd, Zoned: HM, Status: PB Preliminary Review SBL: 269.-3-21

To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: Scott Kitchner Applicant: Stewart's Shops **Last Seen on: 4-28-20**

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Marcus Andrews – Stewart's – Mr. Andrews stated he is here for a redevelopment of an existing Stewart's on Route 146. Mr. Andrews stated that since the Board has last seen this application some changes have been made. He stated that the Stewart's is now a part of the Edison Club PDD and that Stewart's is purchasing 1 acre of land from the Edison Club to reconstruct the store building, replace the gas and canopy, and add another building that would be a car wash. Mr. Andrews stated that there will be a curb cut along Route 146 but it will be further away from the intersection than the current one. Mr. Andrew's stated that the curb cut on Riverview Road as well will continue to be a right in and a right out only due to DOT restrictions. Another concern raised is the walkway on Riverview Road extending further east since there is drainage way under Riverview Road from the Edison Club property, the sidewalk can be transferred to the Stewarts side of the swale on Route 146 that would benefit the store and eliminate any impacts to the drainage swale with the NYS DOT ROW.

Staff Comments:

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 11/16/20 stating:

- Since last review Stewart's parcel has become part of the Edison Club PDD. As a result density and setback requirements are unknown at this time until the Planning Board determines these values so a zoning evaluation can be completed. Note: Previously the Stewart's was in the HM zone and the Edison Club was in the CR zone with an existing PDD. Reference previous variances #80262, #80263 and #80854

Wade Schoenborn, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention:

1. Specify Fire Hydrant locations

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 11/19/20 with the following comments:

1. Since more than one acre is proposed to be disturbed a FULL SWPPP will be required as the project moves forward.

The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 11/17/20 and issued a memo recommending:

1. Per NYS Town Law Section 261-C (Planned Unit Development Zoning Districts), A Town legislative body is authorized to establish planned unit developments. The land which the applicant wishes to append to the existing site is part of the Edison Club PDD. However, the applicant's property and proposed car wash is outside of the existing PDD. The ECC requests that the Town Attorney review if the Town Board needs to approve this lot line adjustment by amending the existing Edison Club PDD.
2. The ECC requests that Stewarts complete a much more extensive study of this project to include but not limited to, water, sewage, traffic flow, parking, buffers, and added screen plantings. An environmental impact study is requested.
3. The ECC recommends that the State or in cooperation with the Town of Clifton Park extend the trail on the east side of NYS Route 146 to at least the intersection of NYS Route 146 and Blue Barns Road.
4. Due to the probability of food and liquid wastes leaking from the on-site dumpster(s) into a storm water catch basin and/or surface water body, the ECC recommends the applicant enclose the area (i.e. roof) on an impervious surface with a berm surrounding the dumpster(s) that accept food and liquid wastes. If necessary, the Applicant will need to periodically pump out the accumulated wastes within the bermed area to avoid any overflow

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a letter dated 10/16/20 with recommendations he made:

1. Since the project is adjacent to NYS Route 146, a referral to the Saratoga Co. Planning Board has been made in accordance with GML §239(m)&(n).
2. The applicant should provide the building area to represent both the carwash and store facility. If the cumulative square footage is above the 4,000 sq.ft. threshold established under NYCRR 617.5(c)(9) Type II Actions – the project shall be classified as an unlisted action pursuant to SEQR.
3. The Clifton Park Town Code provides that approving a Planned Development District, is a legislative function exercised by the local zoning authority, our Town Board. In addition, Town Code §208-75 titled, "Preliminary & Final Development Plan Approval"

notes that the Planning Board and Planning Staff as part of their administrative functions shall consider:

§ 208-75 Preliminary and final development plan approval.

- A. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a preliminary development plan for a full site plan review and approval by the Planning Board in accordance with Article XVI of this chapter and, if applicable, Subdivision, Chapter 179 of the Town Code.
- B. Prior to final site plan and/or subdivision approval, the Planning Department shall assure that said finalized plans are consistent with the original concept plans and the conditions set by the Town Board in the rezoning of the parcel to planned development district.

Based on my review of this site plan submittal, the plan appears to be consistent with the original concept plan presented to the Town Board with the Edison Club PDD II application.

- 4. NYS DOT permit for work within the highway right-of-way (ROW) will be required for utility extensions and replacement, removal and relocation of the driveway for the new shop. The property owner is required to contact Allan Dickson at the Saratoga Springs Residency of the NYS DOT on West Avenue, to discuss the work being done within the State Route 146 ROW. Mr. Dickson can be reached by phone at 518-587-3790 or by email at: allan.dickson@dot.ny.gov
- 5. Provide a photometric plan with manufacturer cutsheet specifications for proposed exterior lighting to include both pole mounted lighting and wall mounted lighting.
- 6. Provide a landscaping plan that details limits of disturbance, vegetation to remain, and new planting/flower beds to be installed.
- 7. As detailed plans advance, additional review and comments will be offered.

Mr. Scavo stated that he did have a discussion with Ms. Viggiani and that she is in support of a trail connection to Riverview Road.

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter dated 11/20/20 had the following comments:

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

1. The SEAF shall be updated to reflect the proposed car wash.
2. Based upon our review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an “Unlisted” action. If the Planning Board is to request Lead Agency status under SEQRA, the need to undergo a coordinated review is optional. Under a coordinated review, involved / interested agencies to be engaged may include, but is not necessarily limited to the following:
 - a) Town of Clifton Park: Site Plan approval
 - b) Saratoga County Planning: 239m and n referral due to location along Route 146
 - c) NYS Dept of Environmental Conservation – permit coverage under stormwater SPDES, confirmation of threatened or endangered species
 - d) NY State Historic Preservation Office: correspondence with SHPO to ensure no archeologically sensitive resources on project site.

Additional agencies may be identified by the Town during its review of the project.

The applicant has submitted Part 1 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF). Based upon our review of the submitted Part 1 SEAF, the following comments are offered:

2. Part I.3a – The response indicates that the proposed action will disturb more than one acre of land. As such a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required.
3. Part I.12b – The response indicates that the project site is located within or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archeological site inventory. The applicant should provide a correspondence letter from SHPO to confirm the presence or absence of archeologically sensitive resources.
4. Part I.13a – The response indicates that a portion of the site or lands adjoining the site of the proposed action, contains wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state or local agency. The applicant has provided documentation that confirms the presence of federally regulated wetlands adjacent to the project site. The applicant should include a 100’ wetland buffer on future site plan submissions.
 Part I.15 – The response indicates that the project site may contain species of animals or associated habitats, listed by the State or Federal government as threatened or endangered, including the Bald Eagle. The applicant will need to provide correspondence from the Permits staff at the NYSDEC Region 5 Office to confirm the presence or absence of these listed species and for any permit considerations for the project. The applicant should also provide correspondence from the NY Natural Heritage Program to confirm the presence or absence of rare plants or animals and significant natural communities.

6. Part I.17 – The response indicates that the proposed action will create stormwater discharge. A stormwater analysis should be conducted to ensure there will be no adverse impacts to adjacent or down gradient properties.
7. No further comments at this time. Additional comments may be forthcoming as the project advances.

SITE PLANS

8. The project appears to be consistent with the Edison Club PDD.
9. The plat shall include the following pursuant to Section 179.8 of the Town Subdivision Law:
 - a. Contour lines at five-foot intervals to United States Geological Survey (USGS) datum pursuant to Section 179-8 of the Town Subdivision Law.
10. Provide a delineation of the area of expected disturbance associated with the project along with the numerical value.
11. The project will disturb more than 1-acre of land. As such, it will be subject to the NYSDEC Phase II Stormwater Regulations and General Permit GP-0-20-001. Therefore, a full SWPPP will be required that addressed water quantity and quality controls. As the project proceeds through the Town's regulatory review process, a fully conforming SWPPP shall be provided for review.
12. Provide the setback lines on the plan.
13. The submitted information indicates the project is proposing to connect to an existing water main(s) within proximity to the parcel. These mains are owned and operated by the Clifton Park Water Authority (CPWA). It is recommended that the Town be furnished with documentation that the CPWA is willing and capable of providing potable water to the project.
14. The submitted information indicates the project is proposing to connect to an existing sewer main(s) within close proximity to the parcel. These mains are owned and operated by the Town of Glenville. It is recommended that the Town be furnished with documentation that the Town of Glenville is willing and capable of providing sanitary sewer service to the project.
15. Provide the locations of the existing potable water and sanitary sewer laterals that the project will be connecting to.
16. The plans show various improvements within the County Route 91 and State right-of-ways. These improvements need to be coordinated with and reviewed by the Saratoga

Count Dept of Public Works and NYSDOT. As the project proceeds through the Town's review, the applicant must provide the Town with plan comments from the County Dept of Public Works and NYSDOT.

17. At the driveway access to Riverview Road, a curb ramp should be installed on the either side of the crosswalk entering the sidewalk.
18. Will the access onto Riverview Road remain as Do Not Enter from eastbound traffic on Riverview Road?
19. Provide notation on the plan as follows:
 - a. No Utilities shall be installed beneath the proposed driveways.
 - a. Any work required within the State or County right-of-way shall be subject to any permitting from the NYSDOT and Saratoga County Highway Department (driveway, culvert, water service, sewer).
20. Considering the plan submitted is conceptual in nature, we will reserve further comments until more detailed plans and reports are submitted. Subsequent submissions shall include information as outlined in Section 208-115 of the Town zoning specific to site grading, lighting, landscaping, erosion control and stormwater management to fully assess the design and its compliance to the applicable standards.

Public Comments:

Anthony LaFleche – 21 Wheeler Drive – Mr. LaFleche stated that he supports the right turn only for the Riverview Road access. He stated that he would like to see the shrubbery near the entries and exits stay but would like them not blocking the view of vehicles that are exiting the premises. Mr. LaFleche asked for clarification on where the sidewalk would be. Mr. Andrews showed on the Zoom screen the trail and stated that there will also be a floating easement for the Edison Club as well for a possible future connection into their residential development plans. Mr. LaFleche asked that if the land to the east of the sidewalk could be left for possible bike access, as well as an easement for Route 146 as well.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Neubauer asked why the sidewalk is on Riverview and not on 146. Mr. Andrews stated that the original thought was the deep drainage swale on 146, and Riverview was more flat. Mr. Andrews said that they found out there was drainage on Riverview as well so that's why they moved the walkway closer. Mr. Neubauer stated that he would like to see the walkway go along Route 146 to provide a more direct access to the picnic area instead of in front of the car wash

and cutting over drive aisles two separate times as shown. Mr. Andrews stated that it is not difficult to bring the walkway on the east side of the drainage swale along Route 146. Mr. Szczesny stated that the traffic is more on Route 146 than it is on Riverview so the pedestrians would be more protected as is. Mr. Ferraro stated that due to the drainage ditch it was initially established that the Riverview path would be best but if it can be moved further in from the road on 146 he would be in favor of it. Mr. Scavo stated that there were concerns with the state right of way and the path going through it. But there may be wetlands lining Rt. 146 before and after the entrance. Mr. Scavo cautioned the Board about trading off the planting beds for the sidewalk on Route 146. Mr. Andrews stated they would like to keep the mature trees and remove the small shrubs and replace them with perennials but they can move the new plantings over to fit the sidewalk. Mr. Andrews stated that to the north of the driveway on Route 146 would be wet and would be troublesome to try to get an extension on the walkway. Mr. Scavo stated that mitigation can be done in the future if needed and he is ok with keeping the sidewalk limited to the Stewart's Shop frontage adjacent to Route 146 at this time.

Mr. Ferraro asked if there would be a connection that would be able to be made without interfering with the wetlands to the north of the site. Mr. Scavo stated that since the Edison PDD may have a direct walkway from the north rear of Stewarts, the path may be able to cut in to the new development with the Edison Club and then come back out to Route 146 just past the wetlands before the post office at the existing golf course property adjacent to Route 146. Mr. Scavo stated that it is a part of the Town master plan as well. Mr. Scavo stated that Riverview Road is also on the Town's trails master plan. Mr. Ferraro asked Mr. Andrews if a trail easement would be considered for the Riverview Road side of the property.

Mr. Neubauer stated that he would like to see a more robust landscaping plan. Mr. Andrews stated that can be done. Mr. Neubauer stated that it is important for the north eastern boundary because there will eventually be no buffer from the golf club and he would like a visual assessment.

Mr. Ophardt suggested cutting in the crosswalk off of Route 146 closer to the gas pumps to have better visibility for pedestrians and a more direct route to the picnic area. Mr. Andrews stated they can look into that and it makes sense. Mr. Ophardt asked who maintains the Rexford sign. Mr. Andrews state he does not know but will find out.

Mr. Ferraro asked how the right in and out will be managed on Riverview Road and asked if it can be a right in but a left and right out. The alternative for motorists wanting to go east on Riverview Road would require them to make a left turn onto Route 146 and then a left to Riverview Road. The left out to 146 is more dangerous than a left onto Riverview Road. Mr. Ophardt stated it does pose a problem in peak traffic times to have someone cross over 2 lanes of traffic. Mr. Andrews stated that a right in and 2 lanes out for the exit on Riverview as to help not

block exiting traffic. Mr. Andrews stated that the County has lining and striping of the roadway planned out as right in and right out in their plans.

Mr. Andarawis asked if the Riverview access has been move to the east since the 146 access was moved to the north. Mr. Andrews stated it has been moved to the east slightly but it is not significant as there are restrictions such as guard rails.

Mr. Ferraro asked if there was sufficient water for the car wash. Mr. Andrews stated that he did reach out to water and sewer to verify but he will get it in writing for the Board. Mr. Ferraro asked if there would be any EV stations, Mr. Andrews stated not at this time but he can look into it and see if there is room for them on the site. Mr. Ferraro asked for a visual of the canopy design. Mr. Andrews showed the design on the Zoom screen and stated it is similar to the others that were done in Clifton Park. Mr. Neubauer likes the shingled look as it is in a residential area he also suggested a cupola/lantern to the top of the building as well, similar to the Stewarts shop adjacent to I-87 Exit 8 on Crescent Road.

New Business:

2020-054 Parkside Covenant Church Addition

Applicant proposes constructing a 9,876 sf building addition with 29 new parking spaces on the north side of the existing church to be used for a daycare/preschool and office space. A new stormwater retention area will be constructed at the Northwest end of the new building.

Original church plan had 29 parking spaces land-banked, *14 Jarose Pl, Zoned: R-1, Status: PB*
Concept Review SBL: 277.16-2-19

To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: ABD Applicant: Starpoint Church

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Luigi Palleschi – EDP – Mr. Palleschi stated that Pastor Roscoe Lilly, pastor of Starpoint Church is participating in the meeting and is also available to answer any questions that may be raised for the applicant. Mr. Palleschi stated that a previous site plan was approved for the existing church which is about 9,500 square feet with 106 parking spaces; when this was approved 29 additional parking spaces were approved and land banked to be built when needed, however is now included in this application for transparency purposes. Mr. Palleschi stated that the church is in a residential area. The church is allowed in the R1 Zoning District and obtained a special use permit that was granted in 2002, that also includes daycare services for young children. Mr. Palleschi is proposing a 9,800 square foot addition that he showed on the Zoom screen and sated it is on the north side of the original building with a connecting corridor. He stated that there are 29 parking spaces on the north end of the edition and stormwater will be maintained on site and the new addition would include church offices, additional daycare facility, and preschool offices.

He stated the existing building is the worship center and holds about 284 seats. He stated the addition is needed for worship times on Sundays when children go to the classroom settings to receive different religious teaching geared towards specific age cohort groups. He stated that parents go to the worship while children receive a separate religious address in the classroom settings that also has a nursery for babies and a separate toddler, children, and older children sections. Daycare would be available during the week as it is now with the offices located in the addition. Mr. Palleschi stated the seating would remain the same and that the number of capacity for the daycare would remain the same. Mr. Palleschi stated the existing utilities are water and sewer and the proposal will to have the addition connect to these. He stated that the disturbance would be less than one acre so a full SWPPP would not be needed and since the ground is sandy soils, green stormwater management with infiltration will be utilized as per town code. Mr. Palleschi stated comments have been reviewed and he has no concerns with them and hopes to address them.

Pastor Lilly stated that his church currently operates from the building in 21st Century Park. The church is looking to purchase this property when they found out that this property due to declining membership has the potential to become a vacant place of worship in 2021, thereby closing the affordable daycare to the community and church member families. He stated that the idea of purchasing this property is inviting but the amount of space that is currently needed at Century Park is more than what is here and is why they are proposing an addition. He stated classrooms are needed as well as office space for the staff members. Pastor Lilly stated that there would be no more increase in traffic, but the parking is more for convenience.

Staff Comments:

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 11/16/20 stating:

- Proposal is to more than double the size of the existing building
- Even though the same owner, variances will be required for zero parking setbacks due to new parking area extending over property line.
- Current SWPPP should be reviewed in conjunction with new proposal since “sheet flow” to existing storm water area is not an accurate description. There are infiltration trenches along the existing building. This is a significant addition of impervious area and a full SWPPP for the entire site will be required. Due to the existing wetlands the SWMA proposed may not be viable
- Note the dry wells at the north end of the site
- A traffic study should be required since Jarosz and Grooms is an unsignalized intersection
- More comments will follow with more detail

Wade Schoenborn, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention:

1. Provide Fire Department Access to within 150' of all of the Buildings
2. Specify Fire Department Connection locations
3. Specify all Fire Hydrant locations

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 11/19/20 with the following comments:

4. Provide a revised Stormwater Management Report for this project.
5. Provide updated test pit and percolation tests for the existing and proposed stormwater management areas.

The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 11/17/20 and issued a memo recommending:

6. The ECC endorses the Steve Myers comments to John Scavo, dated November 16, 2020, for the Parkside Covenant Church Addition.

The Trails Subcommittee submitted the following comments for the Planning Board to consider in its decision making:

Jennifer Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator:

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a letter dated 10/17/20 with recommendations he made:

1. Since the project is within 500' of CR-91 (Grooms Road), a referral to the Saratoga Co. Planning Board for comment has been made in accordance with GML §239(m)&(n).
2. The proposed project appears to be an Unlisted Action pursuant to SEQRA, and as such, coordinated review is optional. The only involved agency appears to be the Clifton Park Planning Board with Site Plan Approval.
3. Future plans should continue to delineate and confirm the limits of clearing and grading.
4. A lot line adjustment is necessary to ensure the proposed parking expansion to the north is contained on the project parcel. It is understood that the church is the property owner of the adjacent parcel where the encroachment for the parking is shown.
5. More detail regarding site grading and spot elevations should be provided as plans progress.
6. The applicant should verify if the proposed expansion will require additional accessible parking spaces and access isles. Also, the addition may need to have accessible parking spaces added or relocated closest to its front entrance.
7. Future submittals should include a detailed landscaping plan.
8. All proposed lighting, including building mounted lights, should be depicted on the plan.
9. The regulated wetlands present on site should be validated with a current jurisdictional determination letter.
10. Details for the concrete walkway and curbing should be provided on future submittals.

Mr. Scavo stated that a lot line adjustment could be made instead of a variance to avoid encroachment as stated in comment 4.

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter dated 11/20/20 had the following comments:

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

7. Based upon our review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an “Unlisted” action. If the Planning Board is to request Lead Agency status under SEQRA, the need to undergo a coordinated review is optional. Under a coordinated review, involved / interested agencies to be engaged may include, but is not necessarily limited to the following:
 - e) Town of Clifton Park Planning Board: site plan approval

Additional agencies may be identified by the Town during its review of the project.

SHORT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM

The applicant has submitted Part 1 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF). Based upon our review of the submitted Part 1 SEAF, the following comments are offered:

1. Part I. 8a – The response indicates that the proposed action will result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels. The applicant should provide documentation that indicates how much of an increase is anticipated to substantiate the response.
2. No further comments at this time. Additional comments may be forthcoming as the project advances.

SITE PLANS

8. The project resides within the Town’s Residential, R-1 Zoning District. Applicant should provide a project narrative for the proposed use(s) of the new facility to determine if a special use permit will be required.
9. Based upon a review of Section 208-11 of the Town’s Zoning, the lot and proposed uses appear to meet the minimum bulk lot requirements.
10. Provide the breakdown and narrative as to how the number of parking spaces was determined for the uses proposed to determine the number of parking spaces are meeting

the requirements of Section 208-99 of the Town Zoning. Based on this information the required ADA accessible parking spaces can be determined.

11. The proposed lot line adjustment shall be revised to encompass the entire parking lot area on the north side of the property. In the future if these parcels are sold off separately this would eliminate any issues.
12. Based on the date of the delineation and/or prior USACOE/NYSDEC correspondence, the wetlands may require a re-delineation if the validation has expired.
13. The following comments are relative to the site plan and its conformance to the International Fire Code (IFC). The Town Fire Official shall have final authority on the applicability of these comments to the proposed site layout:
 - a. If the proposed building is to be provided with an automatic sprinkler, show the location of the fire department connection to ensure they are reasonably accessible.
 - b. Section 912.2 of the IFC requires a fire hydrant to be located within 100-feet of the building's fire department connection. It is not clear from the plans where the closest hydrant to the site is or where the fire department connection may be. Additional hydrants may be necessary.
 - c. Show or note the location of any required Knox Box associated with the building.
 - d. The fire apparatus access road on the concept plan north of the proposed addition appears greater than 150 feet in length so a turn-around will be required to meet Section 503.2.5 of the IFC.
 - e. Section 503.1.1 of the International Fire Code (IFC) requires an approved fire apparatus access road be provided for every facility, building or portion of a building and shall extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building. Confirm that there is adequate fire access being provided.
 - f. Provide a turning template analysis for the largest emergency vehicle that may respond to an event at the site.
14. Identify the actual height of the building. If greater than 30-feet in height above the average grade plan, aerial apparatus access shall be provided that is between 15 and 30 feet of one entire side of the building in accordance with Appendix D105 of the IFC. If aerial apparatus access is required, its location shall be identified on the plans.
15. There needs to be a determination if the proposed building construction and use will warrant automatic sprinklers as prescribed in the Building Code of New York State. This information is needed to determine whether an on-site hydrant is required to satisfy the requirements of Section 508.8 of the FCNYS.

16. There should be confirmation that the anticipated water usage and sewer generation as a result of the building addition does not exceed any permit thresholds imposed by other regulatory agencies having jurisdiction.
17. The submitted information indicates the project is proposing to connect to an existing water main(s) within proximity to the parcel. These mains are owned and operated by the Clifton Park Water Authority (CPWA). It is recommended that the Town be furnished with documentation that the CPWA is willing and capable of providing potable water to the project.
18. The submitted information indicates the project is proposing to connect to an existing sewer main(s) within close proximity to the parcel. These mains are owned and operated by the Saratoga County Sewer District No. 1 (SCSD). It is recommended that the Town be furnished with documentation that the SCSD is willing and capable of providing sanitary sewer service to the project.
19. For any existing utilities that are to be abandon, there location shall be noted, and the extent of removals/abandonment identified in accordance with authorities having jurisdiction.
20. Provide the locations of the existing potable water and sanitary sewer laterals that the project will be connecting to.
21. The plans need to indicate how roof drainage from the new building expansion will be collected and conveyed to the on-site stormwater management system.
22. The project will disturb more than 1-acre of land. As such, it will be subject to the NYSDEC Phase II Stormwater Regulations and General Permit GP-0-20-001. Therefore, a full SWPPP will be required that addressed water quantity and quality controls. As the project proceeds through the Town's regulatory review process, a fully conforming SWPPP shall be provided for review.
23. Subsequent plans should include architectural elevations of the building with a listing of the materials of construction for review by the Planning Board.
24. Considering the plan submitted is conceptual in nature, we will reserve further comments until more detailed plans and reports are submitted. Subsequent submissions shall include information as outlined in Section 208-115 of the Town zoning specific to site grading, lighting, landscaping, erosion control and stormwater management to fully assess the design and its compliance to the applicable standards.

Public Comments:

Anthony LaFleche – 21 Wheeler Drive – Mr. LaFleche asked if there was potential for a trail along the south side of Grooms Road where the home is that the church owns and if there could be an easement for a possible trail. Mr. Scavo stated he believes so and can find out. Mr. LaFleche asked the applicant if the light grey driveways shown on the plans are existing drives, Mr. Palleschi stated yes. Mr. LaFleche asked if the first driveway could be moved towards Grooms Road to create a T for the entry rather than the curve. Mr. Palleschi stated he is ok with what they have now as this parking is mostly for staff members.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Andarawis commented that this request makes sense for the use, but asked why the parking to the north is necessary. Mr. Andarawis stated it was said that no additional parking is needed but for convenience and he would like to hear the rational with the new building. Mr. Palleschi stated that there is a requirement for additional access to provide for emergency access for fire as the code requires 150 feet to the rear so by providing parking this is serving a dual purpose. Mr. Andarawis asked that if the addition was in the grassy area to the south would the access still be needed. Mr. Palleschi stated that it was analyzed and determined it would fit better where it is and they would like to keep the garden area that is existing now. Mr. Ferraro stated he understands fire access but if the parking could be reduced to one row. Mr. Palleschi stated he can discuss it with the applicant.

Mr. Ferraro stated that there is a question if a full SWPPP is required as Mr. Lippmann stated it would be in his comments. Mr. Palleschi stated that now he feels comfortable that it will be under an acre now but knows if it does go over, a full SWPPP will be needed. Mr. Lippmann stated that this is on an existing site and that this is previously disturbed so the new project should be incorporated into the previous SWPPP. Mr. Lippmann stated that a gravel roadway would still be needed to get to the rear of both the buildings as well for fire access. Mr. Palleschi stated he thought that past codes do not apply and that he needed to follow today's standards but if this is what is needed he will look into it.

Mr. Neubauer stated he agrees with the comment made about seeing architectural elevations due to the location of this site adjacent to the residential area. Mr. Neubauer stated that he thought the bulk of activity is morning and afternoon pickup for the daycare facility and asked if the new use would remain and function the same with a canopy drop-off. Mr. Palleschi stated that he can provide the existing elevations stating that it is 34 feet to the roof and to the top of the steeple is 61 feet. He stated the addition would extend off the side of the existing building and would be less than 30 feet. He stated the intent is to make this look like they were always built together. Pastor Lilly stated that the canopy will remain as a drop off for the day care and Summit

afterschool care and he hopes to keep it as numbers are down due to COVID. Pastor Lilly stated that enrolment was 75-100 at peak but those numbers have not been at that for a while.

Mr. Ferraro asked about the traffic conflict and that it needs to be evaluated. On the Assessment form it was marked that the expansion would increase traffic but the comments made in the presentation stated it would not. Mr. Palleschi stated that the assessment form was not filled out correctly as it was filled out as it was in the past and that the traffic would not increase as the space is mostly for children and children do not drive and he will correct the paperwork. Mr. Ferraro asked if enrollment would increase. Pastor Lilly stated that he is not looking to expand or grow the daycare but to maintain it and create classrooms for Sundays where children received religious education messages separate from the adults within the congregation. Mr. Ferraro asked if the SUP still applies. Mr. Scavo stated it is just a site plan review and not a new SUP as it was previously granted.

Mr. Ophardt asked the number of patrons would be on Sundays. Pastor Lilly stated about 300 for the adult and 269 seats would be for the church with 2 services and the children would be in the classrooms. Mr. Ophardt asked if 269 congregants then additional parking is in question as there seems to be sufficient. Pastor Lilly stated they average 2 people per car as many time people, including families come separate for many reasons.

Discussion Items:

None

Mr. Szczesny moved, seconded by Mr. Ophardt adjournment of the meeting at 11:16 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on December 8th, 2020.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Cooper

Paula Cooper, Secretary