TOWN OF WILTON
22 TRAVER ROAD
WILTON, NY 12831-9127
(518) 587-1939 Ext. 201

PLANNING BOARD
William Rice,
Chairman
Harold VanEarden,
Vice Chairman
David Gabay
Christopher Price
Thomas Murphy
James Deloria
Dean Kolligian
Amanda Pelfrey,
Alternate
Jay Rifenbary,
Alternate

Amy DiLeone
Executive Secretary
Planning & Engineering

Ryan K. Riper, P.E.
Director of Planning &
Engineering

Joshua Carlsson
Land Use Administrator

Mark Schachner
Planning Board Counsel

PLANNING BOARD

A meeting of the Wilton Planning Board ("the Board") was held on Wednesday, October 21, 2026, at 6:30 P.M. at Gavin Park, Wilton, New York.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Rice reviewed the public hearing procedures and asked those wishing to speak to keep their comments to approximately three minutes so that everyone would have an opportunity to be heard. He instructed speakers to address their comments and questions to the Planning Board, remain civil and respectful, and state their names and addresses for the record when called upon. He explained that the Board would receive public comments during the hearing and would address the application after the public hearings concluded and the regular meeting began.

A. Route 50 Senior Housing Project – The Markstone Group

Application for a senior housing (55+) community consisting of 390 units at 4029 NYS Route 50 on approximately 29.97 acres, Tax Map No. 154.-1-1.1; zoned C-1.

Scott Lansing of Lansing Engineering is here to represent the Route 50 Senior Housing application.

Mr. Lansing provided an overview of the proposed development:

- **Project:** A 55-and-over senior living community. Based on the applicant's experience with other facilities, the anticipated resident age range is generally from the early 60s through the late 70s.
- **Residential Buildings:** Two four-story buildings, each approximately 64,000 square feet and containing 195 units, for a total of 390 units.
- **Clubhouse:** Approximately 13,000 square feet, connecting the two buildings toward the rear center of the property. Amenities would include meeting rooms, a gym, gathering areas, game rooms, and other resident spaces.
- **Access:** A primary boulevard-style entrance from Route 50 and a secondary access near the northern portion of the parcel.
- **Roadways:** All internal roadways would be privately owned, operated, and maintained by the applicant and would not be dedicated to the Town.
- **Parking:** 134 garage spaces within the residential buildings, along with approximately 450 exterior parking spaces. Mr. Lansing stated that the proposed parking exceeds Town Code requirements.

Setbacks and Green Space

Mr. Lansing reviewed the proposed setbacks and explained that the project exceeds the applicable minimum requirements:

- Required front yard setback: 50 feet; proposed: approximately 154 feet.
- Northern pavement setback: approximately 159 feet.
- Southern pavement setback: approximately 106 feet.
- Required building side yard setback: 100 feet.
- Proposed northern building setback: approximately 226 feet.
- Proposed southern building setback: approximately 167 feet.
- Required green space: 25%; proposed: approximately 73%.
- Existing vegetation along the side boundaries would be maintained, with no clearing or grading proposed within 100 feet of the sides of the structures.

Utilities, Stormwater and Site Amenities

- The project would be served by public water and public sewer.
- Stormwater would be managed on site under a prepared Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.
- Sidewalks and trails are proposed around the property, with connections to the pathway along Route 50 and toward the neighboring community to the north.
- Additional site amenities include street lighting, street trees, bocce ball, a putting green, a dog park, community gardens, pickleball, tennis, open-space areas, and courtyards.

- The proposed Route 50 pathway would extend from the planned roundabout near Jones Road south toward the Wilton Mall.

Previous Approvals and Agency Coordination

Mr. Lansing explained that the project had previously received several approvals, but site plan approvals had expired while the applicant was working through the necessary state agency approvals.

Previous approvals included:

- Special Use Permit from the Town Board.
- Height variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
- Site plan approval from the Planning Board.

The applicant had also received approvals for clearances from the Saratoga County Sewer District, Wilton Water and Sewer Authority, New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation, New York State Department of Transportation, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, New York State Department of Health, and the state agency responsible for the sanitary sewer extension.

Mr. Lansing emphasized that the project layout, configuration, number of units, and parking spaces had not changed since the previous approvals.

Fire Department Comments and Revisions

Mr. Lansing reviewed revisions made in response to comments from the fire department:

- Relocated a hydrant in the central courtyard to a more convenient location.
- Provided additional turning-movement information to demonstrate that fire apparatus could maneuver into the site.
- Added additional hydrants.
- Revised the water-line layout to provide a loop around the rear of the buildings.
- Reviewed hydrant locations and service areas to provide coverage throughout the site.
- Representatives of the Fire District visited a similar Markstone Group facility in Guilderland to review its emergency notification systems and building features.

Mr. Lansing indicated that the meeting with the Fire District had gone well and that the applicant believed the Fire District was satisfied with the information provided.

Mr. Lansing concluded by stating that the applicant had reviewed the technical comments received from the Town and was prepared to address those items as part of the approval process. He reiterated the applicant's request for the Board's consideration of the project.

Public Comments

Chairman Rice opened the floor to public comments and explained that the Board would take the comments and questions under advisement. He stated that the project would be discussed by the Board during the regular meeting following the public hearings.

Nate King – Fire District

Nate King, representing the Greenfield Fire District, addressed the Board regarding the applicant's coordination with the fire department. He stated that the Fire District appreciated the time and effort the applicant had put into addressing its concerns.

Mr. King reported the following:

- Fire District representatives met with Scott Lansing at his office in Malta the previous Wednesday to review concerns raised at the prior Planning Board meeting.
- The Fire District requested a visit to the Markstone Group's facility in Guilderland, which he described as very similar to the proposed Wilton development.
- The Guilderland facility was approximately two years into its first phase and had recently begun its second phase.
- During the visit, Fire District representatives met with two representatives of the developer, the project manager expected to oversee the Wilton project, and the facility's sprinkler and fire alarm technician.
- He described the facility as well laid out for emergency services, with clearly labeled standpipes and fire protection equipment, and stated that the building appeared to be well maintained.
- The Fire District discussed concerns involving fire alarm notifications and cooking-related alarms experienced at another local facility.
- The sprinkler and fire alarm technician indicated that the requested notification configuration could be implemented.

Mr. King stated that the Fire District was pleased with the applicant's willingness to work with them and believed the applicant would continue to operate in addressing fire protection and emergency response requirements.

Steve Bederian – Woodland Drive

Mr. Bederian addressed the proposed pedestrian pathway along Route 50. He stated that the applicant had mentioned a trail or pathway running in the direction of Wilton Mall, but he did not see it reflected on the plans he had reviewed.

Chairman Rice responded that a pathway was proposed along Route 50 and advised that the matter would be discussed during the regular meeting.

Closing of Public Hearing

A motion was made to close the Public Hearing by Mr. Gabay and seconded by Mr. Murphy.

Summary:

- The public hearing addressed the proposed 390-unit senior housing community, including two four-story residential buildings, a central clubhouse, private roads, parking, and site amenities.
- The applicant reviewed the proposed Route 50 multimodal pathway and discussed coordination with the planned roundabout, curb cut, and NYSDOT design and permitting.

- The Board and public raised questions and comments concerning traffic review, pathway timing, neighboring properties, emergency access, and project implementation.

Action Taken: The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Price recused himself from the Car Wash application.

B. KNC Touchfree Car Wash – KNC Touchfree Car Wash, Inc.
Application for a Special Use Permit to construct a 2,700 sq.ft. two-bay touchfree car wash at 542 Maple Avenue (Route 9), on approximately 1 acre, Tax Map No. 153.9-1-5.1; zoned CR-1.

Stephanie Ferradino, attorney and Christian King, applicant/owner are here to represent the KNC Tough Free Car Wash.

Applicant Presentation:

- Stephanie Ferradino, representing KNC Touchfree Car Wash, Inc., appeared before the Board with Caryn Mlodzianowski of Bohler Engineering and members of the applicant's family.
- Ms. Ferradino explained that the proposed facility would be a two-bay, touch-free automatic car wash, which differs from a tunnel-style car wash because vehicles enter individual bays, remain stationary during the wash cycle, and exit after the wash is completed.
- The applicant presented revisions to the site plan since the previous Planning Board meeting, including:
    - Construction of the previously proposed sidewalks at the time of site construction, rather than deferring them to a future date.
    - Revised site access and egress reflecting the right-turn-only exit condition imposed by the Zoning Board of Appeals.
    - Updated architectural renderings incorporating an Adirondack-style appearance, including stone elements and colors consistent with other recently approved projects.
- Ms. Ferradino reviewed the application status, noting that the applicant had received area variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals and was before the Planning Board for consideration of the Special Use Permit. Site plan review would follow as a separate step.
- The applicant stated that the project is classified as a Type II action under SEQRA.
- Chairman Rice opened the floor for public comment and explained that speakers should state their names and addresses for the record and direct their comments to the Board.

Public Comments:

Dr. Frank Isele, 5 Hillcrest Lane, stated that he has lived in the area for approximately 50 years. He recalled that when he first built his home, Loughberry Lake Road was a dirt road and the area was considerably quieter. He explained that traffic conditions have changed significantly over the years, particularly following construction of the middle school. Dr. Isele stated that he walks along Loughberry Lake Road every morning and is familiar with the traffic

patterns. He expressed concern about locating the proposed car wash at the corner of Loughberry Lake Road and Route 9, noting that traffic congestion is particularly difficult during school bus activity, school arrival and dismissal periods, and school events. He stated that drivers attempting to exit Loughberry Lake Road and make a left turn onto Route 9 often experience difficulty and sometimes have to turn right and travel around to reach their destination. He questioned the location of the proposed entrances, noting that one would be located on Loughberry Lake Road and the other on Route 9, approximately 100 feet from the school's main driveway. He expressed concern that vehicles entering and exiting the car wash would add to existing congestion. He also raised concerns about water use and the area's watershed, stating that his private well is connected to underground water sources associated with Loughberry Lake. He was concerned that the car wash would use a substantial amount of water and potentially affect neighboring wells. He also questioned the need for another car wash, noting that another facility is already located near the Mobil station.

James Zack, 4 Woodland Drive, Loughberry Lake neighborhood, stated that he has lived in the neighborhood for approximately 23 years. He asked the Board to consider the knowledge and experience of residents who have lived in the area for many years. He acknowledged that the Planning Board must evaluate the application under the applicable Town Code standards but questioned whether the proposed car wash was reasonably necessary for public health, general interest, or welfare. He stated that while a car wash may be convenient, he questioned whether it was a necessary use at this location. He raised concerns about the project's compatibility with transportation facilities and the availability of water and other public services. Mr. Zack stated that he relies on private well water and has experienced problems with water-level drawdown. He reported that he had to replace his well approximately 12 years earlier and had heard of neighbors having to replace their wells as well. He expressed concern that the proposed facility would be located uphill and less than two-tenths of a mile from a spring run that drains toward a primary source of water for Saratoga Springs. He questioned how the applicant could ensure that contaminants would not reach the water supply, particularly in the absence of sanitary sewer service. He also raised concerns about preserving neighborhood character and safeguarding surrounding property values. He stated that noise, odors, and fumes from the car wash could negatively affect residents' enjoyment of their properties. Referencing Town Code Section 129-163, he questioned whether the Board could reasonably determine that noise and other impacts would not violate the provision. He further expressed concern that the project would create undue traffic congestion or a traffic hazard, describing the existing intersection as already presenting significant traffic challenges. He stated that the proposed project would add to the cumulative traffic impact in the area. He noted that residents have advocated for a traffic signal at the intersection for years, although the road is under State jurisdiction. He also expressed concern that the proposed site plan could limit future traffic-mitigation options, including the possibility of a left-turn lane. He requested that the Planning Board deny the special use permit.

Matt Reals, 9 Woodland Drive, raised concerns regarding the amount of parking provided on the site. He stated that the plan provides 12 parking spaces, whereas he believed 40 spaces were required. He expressed concern that vehicles waiting for service could back up onto Loughberry Lake Road. He stated that the surrounding neighborhood is generally quiet and that the car wash would introduce a different level of noise associated with commercial operations. He questioned

the applicant's use of the service-station classification, stating that the facility would not sell fuel and that car washes are addressed separately in the Town Code. He also referred to a prior car-wash application in the City of Saratoga Springs and expressed concern about the location of this proposal in relation to Loughberry Lake Road and nearby homes. He concluded that the proposed location was inappropriate.

Don Kowalski, 3 Wellington Drive, stated that he has been a Wilton resident since 1993. He expressed concern that a car wash near the middle school would make an already difficult traffic situation substantially worse. He also raised concerns about climate-related weather extremes and extended dry periods, stating that the area's water table and private wells may already be vulnerable. He opposed the proposed car wash at this location.

Louise MacCormack, 1 Woodcrest Drive, urged the Planning Board to deny the special use permit for the proposed KNC Touch-Free Car Wash at 542 Maple Avenue. She acknowledged that the Zoning Board had granted dimensional variances but stated that the Planning Board retained responsibility for evaluating the proposed use and its compatibility with the neighborhood. She referenced Town Code Section 129-176, under which the applicant was seeking approval as a service station, and questioned whether the proposed operation was consistent with the intent of the service-station provisions. She raised concerns about commercial-grade dryers, vacuum stations, noise, vibration, and fumes, particularly given the facility's proximity to residential properties and the middle school. She also referenced Town Code Section 129-163 concerning obnoxious or injurious uses. Ms. MacCormack expressed concern that the car wash could generate chemical odors, mists, vapors, cleaning agents, oils, grease, road residue, and other contaminants. She stated that noise, lighting, and additional commercial traffic could affect neighboring properties and the surrounding environment. She noted that Loughberry Lake Reservoir is approximately one-eighth of a mile downhill from the proposed site. She estimated that the car wash could use approximately 13,000 gallons of well water per day and stated that the neighborhood relies on private wells and that residents have experienced water shortages and declining water levels. She expressed concern that the proposed water use could affect neighboring wells and the community's water supply. She concluded that the proposal did not satisfy the safety, neighborhood compatibility, and public-health standards of the Town Code and requested that the Board deny the application.

Steve Bederian, Woodland Drive, stated that his property is located directly downhill from the proposed site. He reported that his property was on its third well. The original well had gone dry, a replacement well was too shallow and became contaminated, and the property owner had to drill another well at a greater depth. He expressed concern that the proposed car wash could further affect the area's water supply. He noted that his property and others in the neighborhood are not connected to public water and that residents depend on the aquifer for their household water. He expressed serious concern about the potential impact of the proposed facility on that water source.

Helena Brady, 49 Loughberry Lake Road, urged the Planning Board to deny the special use permit and site plan applications for the proposed two-bay automatic car wash. She referenced the Board's responsibility under Town Code Section 129 to protect public health, safety, and general welfare. She expressed concern that the project would create both vehicle-traffic and

pedestrian-safety hazards, describing the intersection of Loughberry Lake Road and Maple Avenue as already dangerous. She stated that the proposed car wash would create additional traffic bottlenecks because it depends on vehicle turnover and customer queuing. She expressed concern that even two or three vehicles waiting for a wash could exceed the available space on the constrained site and that vehicle queues could extend into the travel lanes of Route 9 and Loughberry Lake Road. She raised concerns about drivers entering and exiting the site and the potential for sudden stops and disrupted traffic flow. She stated that drivers turning from Maple Avenue onto Loughberry Lake Road could encounter unsafe conditions, potentially causing traffic to back up or leading other drivers to pass on the right. Ms. Brady emphasized the pedestrian-safety concerns associated with Loughberry Lake Road, describing it as a narrow, rural roadway that lacks painted center lines and, at the time of her comments, sidewalks. She noted that the road is used by joggers, cyclists, families, and other pedestrians. She expressed concern that additional commercial traffic would increase conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians. She also raised concerns about winter conditions, stating that water carried out of the wash bays on vehicle tires could accumulate on the pavement and create localized icy conditions near the site and on Loughberry Lake Road during freezing weather. She was particularly concerned about the location in relation to school-bus turning movements. She acknowledged that the Zoning Board had granted dimensional variances but emphasized that the Planning Board retained responsibility for site-plan and safety review. She stated that the proposed high-volume commercial use was incompatible with the narrow roadway and nearby school and requested that the Board uphold the Town Code and deny the application.

Nate King, representing the Greenfield Fire District, stated that the Fire District had reviewed the proposed project. He reported that representatives visited the applicant's car wash facility in Malta and observed traffic for approximately two hours. During the observation, approximately nine vehicles were observed during the first hour and approximately ten vehicles during the second hour, with no more than two vehicles backed up at any one time. He clarified that the Fire District was not offering a professional traffic analysis. He identified water availability as a concern and requested that, if the project were approved, a condition be included requiring the facility to connect to public water when it becomes available in the area. He referenced a similar requirement imposed on a prior project.

Kevin Brady, 49 Loughberry Lake Road, referred to an issue raised at the previous Planning Board meeting concerning the proposed means of ingress and egress. He asked whether the Planning Board was considering returning to the Zoning Board to request a modification to the access arrangement previously approved. He stated that he had heard comments at the prior meeting suggesting that additional education about the car wash might address neighborhood concerns. He disagreed with the suggestion that residents' concerns were primarily due to a lack of information. He emphasized that many of the people speaking at the hearing lived in the immediate neighborhood and used the affected roads daily. He referred to comments made by a retired school-bus driver at a Zoning Board meeting regarding traffic risks to children. He asked the Planning Board to take residents' concerns seriously, particularly those involving public safety and neighborhood character.

Joe Dalton, 14 Loughberry Road, stated that car washes typically operate approximately ten hours per day and expressed concern about the noise generated by their operation. He stated that

the surrounding roadways do not provide adequate areas for pedestrians to step away from traffic and that the roads are used by pedestrians and maintenance vehicles. He described the residential properties, curves, hills, and intersections along Loughberry Road. He expressed concern that traffic was already difficult and that drivers were increasingly using alternate routes and shortcuts through the neighborhood. He questioned how chemicals and materials washed from vehicles would be handled and where they would go. He stated that the proposed car wash would substantially change the character of a small residential neighborhood.

Tristan, 7 Bennington Loop, stated that he lives near the proposed site and frequently rides his bicycle in the area. He expressed concern about limited visibility for vehicles traveling up and down the hill, noting that drivers may not be able to see other vehicles or cyclists approaching when exiting the proposed car wash. He predicted that the additional traffic could increase the potential for accidents. He noted that another car wash is located approximately five minutes away and that he had observed a line of vehicles at that facility. He expressed concern that additional traffic could interfere with neighborhood travel and school buses. He stated that he was considering riding his bicycle to school and was concerned that traffic associated with the car wash could make that unsafe.

Ann Kauth, 13 Hillcrest Lane, stated that she has lived in the area for approximately 42 years and that four of her children attended local schools. She recalled that when the middle school first opened, her youngest child was nearly struck while attempting to cross the school parking area with a bicycle. She expressed concern that pedestrian and bicycle access around the school has been a longstanding safety issue. She stated that water was also a significant concern but identified traffic as her primary concern. She described observing vehicles attempting to enter and exit the area and stated that drivers frequently take risks because of the difficulty of making turns. She expressed concern about drivers turning out of Loughberry Lake Road and the middle school area and stated that she believed the intersection presented a serious accident risk. She questioned whether another car wash was necessary, noting that residents have other options for washing their vehicles. She acknowledged that some type of development may eventually occur on the property but questioned whether a car wash was appropriate. She asked the Board to consider the long-term character of the community and whether the proposed use would benefit the Town. She suggested that preserving the existing green space would be preferable, if possible, and encouraged the Board to exercise its discretion in deciding whether the project was appropriate for the location.

Daryn Brennan, 59 Loughberry Lake Road, stated that he wanted to speak on behalf of pedestrians and walkers in the neighborhood. He described an incident in which he and his husband encountered an older woman walking with a walker along the road. He explained that some pedestrians in the neighborhood are elderly and may have limited hearing or awareness of approaching vehicles. He stated that residents are familiar with the road and generally drive slowly because they know where pedestrians may be present. He expressed concern that customers traveling to the car wash may be unfamiliar with the road and may be distracted by music, audio, or other activities in their vehicles. He noted that Loughberry Lake Road has curves and turns and does not provide sidewalks in many areas. He expressed concern that additional unfamiliar traffic could put pedestrians at risk and asked the Board to carefully consider the safety of residents who walk along the road.

Elizabeth Kane, 6 Woodland Drive, stated that she lives approximately one block from the proposed site. She expressed concern that the project would create detrimental changes to the essential character of the neighborhood. She stated that the intersection of Loughberry Lake Road and Maple Avenue is already congested, particularly during morning school traffic, afternoon school dismissal, and school programs and other activities. She expressed concern that a new drive-through-type facility would worsen existing congestion. She identified the safety of students, school staff, and neighborhood residents as a primary concern. She stated that increased traffic could also increase cut-through traffic on Loughberry Lake Road and affect residents' ability to walk and bicycle safely and enjoy the neighborhood. She raised environmental concerns involving the local aquifer, potential pollution entering Loughberry Lake Reservoir, noise, and light pollution. She referenced the Town's zoning standards governing adverse effects and special use permits and questioned whether the car wash was reasonably necessary for public health, general interest, or welfare. She stated that the proposed site was not appropriate for this type of facility and expressed concern about potential impacts on property owners, property values, and the quiet enjoyment of nearby properties. She requested that the Board enforce the protections in the Town Code and deny the special use permit.

Jordyn Conway, attorney with Bartlett, Pontiff, Stewart & Rhodes, stated that she had been retained by several residents who own property on Loughberry Lake Road, Hillcrest Lane, Cambridge Court, Kingswood Drive, Bradford Drive, Woodcrest Drive, and Woodland Drive. She informed the Board that her office had submitted a determination request to the Code Enforcement Officer earlier that afternoon concerning whether a standalone car wash qualified as a service station under the Town Code. She referenced the service-station definition, which describes a use involving the supply of gasoline, oil, or other motor-vehicle fuel and which may include facilities for polishing, greasing, and washing. She stated that, after reviewing the definition and the related service-station requirements, her office believed it was unclear whether the Code intended to include a standalone car wash. She requested that the Board obtain the Code Enforcement Officer's determination before acting on the application.

Ms. Conway also raised concerns about the standards applicable to the special use permit. Regarding general interest, she questioned whether the project was reasonably necessary for the general interest or welfare of the community, noting the substantial attendance and opposition expressed at the hearing. Regarding neighborhood character, she stated that the applicant had not adequately demonstrated that the proposed use would preserve the character of the surrounding neighborhood. She stated that the application did not appear to account adequately for existing through traffic and traffic using the neighborhood as a cut-through route. She suggested that a curb or other roadway treatment at the Loughberry Lake Road access might direct traffic toward Route 9 rather than allowing vehicles to back up into the residential neighborhood. She noted that the facility would be unattended and recommended that signage be included near the vacuum stations prohibiting customers from playing loud music while cleaning their vehicles. She also requested that the applicant address how the unattended facility would prevent criminal mischief and other nuisances from occurring on the property.

John Colley, 25 Loughberry Lake Road, stated that he and his family have lived in the area for approximately 30 years. He discussed his involvement in land-preservation and conservation

efforts, including his experience with Saratoga land-preservation organizations. He expressed concern about groundwater movement and the potential for pollutants to travel through underground water sources. He stated that the neighborhood's water resources and the nearby reservoir are important community assets that residents have worked to protect. He reported that, during his time in the area, he had observed three deaths and three serious injuries along Route 9. He attributed his concern to the existing traffic congestion and conditions along Route 9. He stated that adding another traffic-generating use at the intersection would create further risk and concluded that he saw no compelling reason to approve the project at this location.

Dr. Bruce Maslack, 9 Cambridge Court, raised concerns about the property's topography, drainage, and the location of existing Department of Transportation infrastructure. He stated that the DOT had previously acquired a portion of the corner property through eminent domain and installed a storm drain. He explained that the storm drain is located approximately five feet below the road level. He questioned how the proposed sidewalk construction could be accommodated given the elevation differences and the location of the DOT property. He stated that construction of the sidewalks could require fill and potentially relocation or modification of the existing storm drain. He reported that he had spoken with the Department of Transportation and understood that DOT preferred sidewalks to be located within its property boundaries. He expressed concern that these details had not been adequately resolved. He also questioned whether DOT would approve the proposed stormwater discharge arrangement, which appeared to direct runoff toward the existing storm drain.

Dr. Maslack discussed prior efforts by DOT and the middle school to address congestion in the area. He referenced a potential future Route 9 roadway configuration involving three lanes: one northbound lane, one southbound lane, and a center turning lane. He stated that the roadway improvements could affect traffic circulation in the area. He expressed concern about locating the proposed Maple Avenue entrance approximately 100 feet from the intersection, warning that vehicles attempting to turn left into or out of nearby commercial properties could create additional congestion and conflicts. He recommended that the roadway be addressed and congestion reduced before another commercial use is approved at the corner. He noted that directing more traffic onto Loughberry Lake Road would create a separate concern for the residential neighborhood.

Steve Wilcox, Hillcrest Lane, stated that he has been a resident of the area since 1970. He described the area as having changed significantly over the years but emphasized that the proposed site is part of an established residential neighborhood. He stated that the neighborhood has two primary entrances, one from Route 9 and one from Jones Road, and that the roads provide access to residents' homes. He emphasized the neighborhood's sense of community and asked the Board to give residential concerns appropriate weight when evaluating commercial development. Mr. Wilcox explained that he had worked for the New York State Department of Transportation for nearly 39 years and had experience with traffic maintenance and highway design. He raised concerns about the geometry of the proposed Route 9 access, vehicle movements entering and exiting the site, potential conflicts involving vehicles making left turns, and drivers using the road shoulder, which could create additional traffic conflicts.

Mr. Wilcox expressed concern about vehicle queuing during peak winter operations, when snow and ice could make traffic conditions more difficult. He questioned how queues extending onto Loughberry Lake Road would affect vehicles attempting to exit the neighborhood. He also raised concerns about bicycle safety, noting that children are permitted to ride bicycles to the middle school. He questioned the project's Type II SEQRA classification and stated that he had seen circumstances in which similar projects might be classified differently. He referenced Town Code Sections 129-163, concerning obnoxious or injurious uses; 129-164, concerning air and water quality standards; and 129-175, concerning special-use standards. He stated that residents believed the project could be injurious to the neighborhood and could fail to meet the standards concerning public welfare, neighborhood character, and traffic congestion. He asked the Board to consider those standards carefully.

Christina Rice, 14 Hillcrest Lane, stated that she lives in the Loughberry neighborhood and appreciates the community and its residents. She expressed support for the concerns raised about protecting the neighborhood's water resources and children. She stated that residents were concerned about the potential consequences of the project for the community and asked the Planning Board to deny the application. Speaking from the perspective of a small-business owner, she stated that she found it difficult to understand why an applicant would continue pursuing a project despite the concerns expressed by the surrounding community. She emphasized that the neighborhood would welcome businesses that did not create what residents viewed as detrimental impacts.

Lauren Freyer, 16 Wellington Drive, stated that her family moved to the Loughberry neighborhood approximately two years earlier. She expressed appreciation for the Town and the qualities that attracted her family to the area. She reported that she had noticed an increase in traffic during the two years she had lived there. She described vehicles using Loughberry Lake Road as a cut-through route between Jones Road or Gick Road and Route 9. She expressed concern about speeding and vehicles passing pedestrians without slowing down. She stated that she already found it difficult and stressful to make a left turn from Loughberry Lake Road onto Route 9, particularly when traveling with her young children. She noted that development along Route 9 north of the intersection had increased and expressed concern that additional traffic impacts would continue to reach the neighborhood. She stated that her parents had considered moving into the neighborhood to be closer to their grandchildren but had become less interested after learning about the proposed car wash. She questioned whether the project would serve the neighborhood if residents were unlikely to patronize it and whether the project was reasonably necessary if the surrounding community did not want the use. She requested that the Board vote against the project.

Kirsten Keefe, Howe Street, stated that she has lived in the area for just over nine years. She wanted to emphasize the amount of pedestrian traffic in the neighborhood. She explained that pedestrians come from surrounding neighborhoods, including areas near Sidney Hill and across Jones Road and Gick Road. She reported that she frequently drives on Loughberry Lake Road and estimates that approximately 80 percent of the time she sees someone walking a dog or walking along the road. She noted that children also ride bicycles in the area. She questioned whether the project provided a meaningful benefit when compared with its potential impacts. She stated that other car washes are already located nearby and questioned whether the project

would create significant employment, noting her understanding that the facility would not have employees continuously on site. She shared concerns about traffic, water use, impacts on nearby residents, and the overall character of the neighborhood.

Paula Schmid, 19 Foxhound Run, stated that she opposed the proposed project. She reiterated concerns about traffic at the intersection and referred to prior Zoning Board meetings where, according to her recollection, the applicant had stated that the project would not affect traffic. She stated that residents believed the intersection was already unsafe. She raised concerns about water use and reported that she had to replace her well the previous year, although her home was approximately 13 years old. She expressed concern about the proposed facility's water consumption, referring to an estimated 8,000 gallons per day. She read from Town Code Section 129-163, concerning uses that may be obnoxious or injurious because of odors, dust, smoke, refuse, fumes, noise, vibration, or other conditions that could disturb the comfort, peace, enjoyment, health, or safety of the community. She stated that, in her view, the project could have the types of impacts addressed by that provision and questioned why the application was being considered if the proposed use could create those impacts.

Terry Mara, Loughberry neighborhood, stated that she has lived in the neighborhood for approximately 16 years and had been familiar with the area for many years before that. She chose to focus her comments on her personal experience with traffic at the intersection. She described the difficulty of making turns from the neighborhood onto Route 9, particularly during school-related traffic. She recalled asking why a traffic signal had not been installed at the intersection and stated that she had been told that efforts to obtain a traffic signal had been ongoing for more than a decade. She compared the experience of making turns at the intersection to playing "Russian roulette." She expressed concern that traffic conditions had become worse as development along Route 9 increased and questioned whether adding a car wash would make an already difficult situation even more dangerous. She asked the Board to use common sense when evaluating whether the project was appropriate for the location.

Gerald Mattison, Kingswood Drive, stated that he lives close to the proposed project. He compared the estimated water consumption of the car wash with typical household water use. He referenced an estimated daily use of approximately 8,000 gallons. Explaining that, using an average household of four people, that amount of water would be comparable to the daily use of approximately 25 homes, he expressed concern that drawing that amount of water from one localized area could significantly affect nearby properties and private wells. He asked the Board to consider the potential impact on the aquifer.

Vince Walsh, Greene Road, Greenfield Center, stated that he opposed the project because of concerns involving the community, water, traffic, and personal impacts. He emphasized that the affected roadway is used by residents from Greenfield, South Glens Falls, and other surrounding communities, not just Wilton residents. He stated that municipal boundaries do not change the fact that the area is part of a shared community and transportation corridor. He echoed concerns raised by other speakers and asked the Board to remember that many residents who could not attend or did not feel comfortable speaking may also be concerned. He questioned how a project using more than 10,000 gallons of water per day could be considered to have no adverse environmental impact. He asked whether the City of Saratoga Springs had

been consulted because of the relationship between the project area and the Loughberry Lake watershed.

Mr. Walsh stated that he has two children attending Maple Avenue Middle School and is familiar with the traffic conditions during school arrival, dismissal, and other times of day. He asked whether the school district, school transportation department, and school-bus drivers had been contacted for input. He referenced the applicant's narrative and its discussion of safe and efficient transportation, Town character, and quality of life. He stated that the proposed project could negatively affect the quality of life of residents and people traveling through the area. He asked how the identified concerns could be corrected after construction if the project were approved and the predicted impacts occurred. He concluded that growth should be approached through smart planning. He added that he had experienced a similar situation in another neighborhood involving an unattended facility operating around the clock. He expressed concern about the potential for after-hours activity, noise, traffic, and nuisances when no employees are present to monitor the property.

Tina Damiano, 17 Bennington Loop, stated that she has lived in the area for approximately 22 years and has had three children attend the school district. She expressed opposition to placing a car wash in the middle of a residential neighborhood. She reiterated concerns about existing traffic conditions and the frequency of traffic accidents in the area. She stated that the Sheriff's Office is regularly present at the intersection during morning and afternoon periods. She emphasized that the Board has a responsibility to consider the community's safety and the interests of residents. She described regularly walking throughout the neighborhood and stated that pedestrian activity is widespread. She reported that traffic has continued to increase over time. She raised concerns about the area's private wells and asked whether anyone could guarantee that the proposed water use would not affect the water table or neighboring wells. She noted that replacing a well could cost approximately $3,000 to $10,000 and stated that this would be a significant financial burden for many homeowners. She also raised environmental concerns involving wildlife and the potential effects of development and pollution on animals in the area. She expressed concern about contaminants associated with vehicles, including dirt, sand, road salt, gasoline, and oil. She concluded by reiterating that the fact that a project may be permitted does not necessarily mean it is appropriate for the location.

Closing of the Public Hearing

A motion was made to close the Public Hearing by Mr. Gabay and seconded by Mr. Rifenbary.

Summary of Issues Raised During the Public Hearing

- The public comments focused primarily on traffic and intersection safety, pedestrian and bicycle safety, water consumption and private wells, environmental impacts, noise and neighborhood character, and the classification of the proposed use under the Town Code.
- Residents expressed concern about existing congestion at Route 9 and Loughberry Lake Road, difficulty making left turns onto Route 9, the proximity of the proposed entrance

to the middle school driveway, and the possibility of vehicle queues extending onto Route 9 or Loughberry Lake Road. Several speakers discussed cumulative traffic impacts from continued development along Route 9.

- Pedestrian and bicycle safety was another recurring concern. Speakers described regular pedestrian use of Loughberry Lake Road, children walking and bicycling to the middle school, narrow roadways, limited visibility, curves, and the lack of sidewalks in portions of the neighborhood. Residents were concerned about potential conflicts between unfamiliar customers and pedestrians.
- Water consumption and the potential impact on private wells were also raised repeatedly. Residents described their reliance on private wells and reported experiences involving dry, shallow, or contaminated wells. Speakers cited different estimates of the proposed facility's water use, including approximately 8,000, 10,000, and 13,000 gallons per day. These were figures cited during public comments and were not findings established by the Board. Concerns were also raised about aquifer drawdown and the Loughberry Lake watershed.
- Environmental concerns included potential contamination from cleaning chemicals, oils, grease, road salt, and vehicle residue; proximity to Loughberry Lake Reservoir; stormwater drainage and the existing DOT storm drain; and potential effects on wildlife and the surrounding environment.
- Residents also expressed concern about noise from dryers and vacuum equipment, potential customer activity at an unattended facility, lighting, odors, and the compatibility of a commercial car wash with the surrounding residential neighborhood.
- Several speakers questioned whether a standalone car wash qualified as a service station under the Town Code and requested a Code Enforcement Officer determination. Residents also questioned whether the project satisfied the special-use standards concerning public welfare, neighborhood character, and traffic safety, and raised questions about the Type II SEQRA classification.
- The Greenfield Fire District representative reported that the District had observed traffic at the applicant's Malta facility for approximately two hours. The observation showed approximately nine vehicles in the first hour and ten in the second hour, with no more than two vehicles backed up at any one time. The Fire District identified water availability as a concern and requested a future connection to public water when available.

Action Taken: The public hearing was closed.

III. REGULAR MEETING

PRESENT: Chairman William Rice, David Gabay, Christopher Price, Tom Murphy, Amanda Pelfrey, alternate, and Jay Rifenbary, alternate. Ryan K. Riper, P.E., Director of Planning and Engineering, Mark Schachner, Planning Board Counsel, Josh Carlsson, Land Use Administrator, and Amy DiLeone, Executive Secretary.

ABSENT: Hal VanEarden, Jim Deloria, and Dean Kolligian

The Board addressed the minutes of the September 16, 2026, meeting. A motion was made by Mr. Price and seconded by Mr. Murphy to approve the minutes as written; the motion carried.

IV. APPLICATIONS

A. Route 50 Senior Housing Project – The Markstone Group

Application for a senior housing (55+) community consisting of 390 units at 4029 NYS Route 50 on approximately 29.97 acres, Tax Map No. 154.-1-1.1; zoned C-1.

Scott Lansing of Lansing Engineering is here to represent the Route 50 Senior Housing application. **Applicant Presentation and Board Review**

- The applicant, representing The Markstone Group, indicated that the proposal had not materially changed since the public hearing.
- The Board reviewed the proposed 390-unit senior housing development, consisting of:
    - Two four-story residential buildings.
    - A central clubhouse connecting the residential buildings.
    - Private internal roadways.
    - Garage and exterior parking.
    - Associated recreational amenities and open space.
- The applicant reviewed the outstanding comments and items requiring further coordination, particularly the Route 50 multimodal pathway.

Route 50 Multimodal Pathway

- The Board discussed the proposed multimodal pathway along Route 50 and its relationship to the planned roundabout and proposed site entrance.
- Coordination with the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) will be necessary to address the roundabout, curb cut, pathway alignment, design, and permitting.
- The Board discussed the timing of pathway construction in relation to the proposed development phases.
- The applicant is to revise the project phasing plan to show the entire Route 50 multimodal pathway being constructed as part of Phase One.
- The pathway must be completed within two years of issuance of the first building permit.
- The Board emphasized the need to coordinate the pathway design and construction with the Town's planned roadway improvements and NYSDOT requirements.

Traffic Review and Coordination

- The applicant and Lansing Engineering are to continue working with the Town to address comments from the third-party traffic review.
- Additional clarification and traffic information are to be provided as requested by the Town's traffic reviewer.

- A meeting is to be scheduled with NYSDOT and the Town to coordinate the overall layout of the roundabout, curb cut, and multimodal pathway.
- The Town is to be included in correspondence and coordination with NYSDOT concerning the curb-cut and pathway design and permitting.

Additional Site Plan Items

- **Monument Sign:** The applicant is to submit a schematic of the proposed monument sign for review. Sight-distance considerations are to be addressed as part of the sign-permit review.
- **Building Materials:** The applicant is to provide a building-material sample board to the Town so that the proposed materials and colors can be reviewed and documented.
- **Project Phasing:** The phasing plan is to be revised to clearly identify the construction phases and show the full Route 50 pathway in Phase One.
- **Traffic Information:** The applicant and Lansing Engineering are to address the outstanding third-party traffic-review comments and provide any necessary clarifications.

Action Taken

- The Planning Board approved the Preliminary Site Plan for the Route 50 Senior Housing Project by The Markstone Group.
- The approval included continued coordination and follow-up on the Route 50 multimodal pathway, NYSDOT review, traffic comments, monument-sign details, and building-material documentation.

Follow-Up Items

- Schedule a coordination meeting with NYSDOT regarding the Route 50 roundabout, curb cut, and multimodal pathway design and permitting.
- Revise the phasing plan to show the entire multimodal pathway constructed with Phase One and completed within two years of the first building permit.
- Submit the monument-sign schematic for review, including sight-distance considerations.
- Provide the building-material sample board to the Town.
- Work with Lansing Engineering and the Town's traffic reviewer to resolve the outstanding third-party traffic-review comments and provide clarifying traffic information.

Summary:

- The applicant stated that the proposal had not materially changed since the public hearing and reviewed the outstanding pathway comments.
- The Board reviewed the 390-unit, 55-plus community, including two four-story buildings, a clubhouse, private roads and parking, and resident amenities.
- The Board discussed the Route 50 multimodal pathway, its relationship to the planned roundabout and curb cut, and coordination with NYSDOT. The pathway is to be

completed within two years of the first building permit, with the applicant asked to revise the phasing plan to show the full pathway in Phase One.
- Follow-up items include a meeting with NYSDOT regarding the roundabout, curb cut, pathway design, and permitting; submission of a monument-sign schematic for sign-permit review with sight-distance considerations; and provision of a building-material sample board to document approved materials and colors.
- The applicant and Lansing Engineering are to address third-party traffic-review comments and provide clarifying traffic information.

Action Taken: The Board approved the Preliminary Site Plan for the Route 50 Senior Housing Project. Mr. Rifenbary made a motion, seconded by Mr. Murphy; the motion carried.

Mr. Price recused himself from the Car Wash application.

B. KNC Touchfree Car Wash – KNC Touchfree Car Wash, Inc.

Application for a Special Use Permit to construct a 2,700 sq.ft. two-bay touchfree car wash at 542 Maple Avenue (Route 9), on approximately 1 acre, Tax Map No. 153.9-1-5.1; zoned CR-1.

Stephanie Ferradino, attorney and Christian King, applicant/owner are here to represent the KNC Tough Free Car Wash.

Applicant Presentation and Project Revisions:

- Stephanie Ferradino, representing KNC Touchfree Car Wash, Inc., presented additional information in response to questions and concerns raised during the public hearing.
- The applicant explained that the existing car wash farther south on Maple Avenue is being displaced by redevelopment, and the proposed facility would serve as its replacement rather than creating two operating locations in close proximity.
- Revised architectural renderings were presented to reflect the Board's previous comments. The proposed building incorporates an Adirondack-style appearance, stone elements, and revised colors intended to be consistent with the surrounding area and other approved projects.
- The applicant stated that the site would provide approximately 60% green space, exceeding the stated 35% requirement.
- The applicant explained that the proposed development would occupy one of three adjoining tracts offered for sale, rather than developing the entire approximately three-acre area as a single project.
- The applicant stated that the touch-free, two-bay design would generate less traffic and use less water than certain other commercial uses that could be permitted in the district.
- Revisions made during the review process include:
    - Reorienting the building parallel to Maple Avenue.
    - Relocating the vacuum area from the front to the side of the building.
    - Providing fencing and landscaping around the vacuum area.
    - Providing a fence and staggered vegetation along the common boundary with the neighboring residential property, including two large Norway spruce trees.
    - Reducing the proposed hours of operation from 24 hours a day to 7:00 a.m. through 8:00 p.m.
    - Providing a Town easement along Loughberry Lake Road and a cross-access easement to the adjoining northern parcel.

  - Installing the proposed sidewalks concurrently with construction of the facility rather than deferring them to a future phase.
  - Revising the site access to reflect the right-turn-only exit condition imposed by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

- The applicant confirmed that area variances had been granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals and that the current application was for a Special Use Permit. Site plan review would follow as a separate approval step.
- The applicant reiterated that the project is classified as a Type II action under SEQRA.

Special Use Permit Criteria:

- The applicant addressed the applicable Special Use Permit standards, including public interest and welfare, the suitability of the location, neighborhood character, traffic safety, and compliance with applicable zoning requirements.
- Regarding public benefit, the applicant stated that a commercial car wash provides a controlled washing facility using biodegradable soaps and detergents and can reduce the water use and uncontrolled runoff associated with washing vehicles at home.
- The applicant stated that the sidewalks would improve pedestrian accommodation along the property frontage and that the proposed landscaping and building design would improve the appearance of the currently underutilized property.
- Regarding location and services, the applicant noted that the property fronts Route 9, a state highway, and stated that fire protection, water service, and wastewater disposal facilities were available to serve the proposed use.
- The applicant maintained that the proposed use was compatible with the surrounding commercial corridor and referenced the Town Comprehensive Plan's direction to concentrate development in the applicable neighborhood area.
- The applicant also discussed the applicable Special Use Permit standards concerning the protection of neighboring properties, noise, traffic congestion, and other requirements specific to the proposed use.

Water Consumption and Groundwater:

- The applicant provided additional information regarding anticipated water consumption in response to residents' concerns about private wells, groundwater, and the Loughberry Lake watershed.
- The applicant stated that the proposed equipment would use approximately 62 gallons of water per vehicle wash, based on operating data from a comparable facility.
- The applicant compared this figure with the higher water consumption of the existing car wash operation, explaining that updated equipment would improve water efficiency.
- The applicant reported an average of approximately 45 vehicles per day at its comparable operation, while acknowledging that demand varies significantly by season and weather.
- The applicant distinguished average daily use from peak-day demand, reporting that a particularly busy day at the Union Street location involved 216 vehicles. The applicant explained that the peak-day figure was not representative of typical daily operations.
- The applicant also described an 8,000-gallon storage tank used to accommodate peak demand, with the tank replenished during lower-demand periods.
- A letter from a hydrogeologist was referenced in support of the applicant's position regarding groundwater conditions and well performance. The applicant summarized the letter as indicating that recent well work had not involved replacing wells because of a declining water table.

- The applicant explained that the equipment uses high-pressure, low-volume washing and reuses water generated by its water-softening and reverse-osmosis processes for undercarriage washing.
- The applicant stated that water use had decreased substantially with newer equipment, citing a reduction from approximately 190 gallons per wash to approximately 62 gallons per wash.
- Board members discussed the information presented and the need to understand the potential effect of the proposed water demand on surrounding groundwater resources and private wells.

Stormwater, Wash Water, and Wastewater Disposal:

- Caryn Mlodzianowski of Bohler Engineering addressed questions regarding stormwater management and wastewater disposal.
- The engineer explained that stormwater would be managed on site through proposed infiltration and stormwater management basins, with landscaping provided around the facilities.
- The applicant reported that preliminary infiltration testing supported the proposed stormwater management approach.
- The engineer distinguished stormwater runoff from water generated during the car-washing process.
- The applicant stated that wash water would be collected through a closed system and discharged to the Saratoga County Sewer District's sanitary sewer system, rather than being discharged to the site's stormwater system or directly to the ground.
- The applicant maintained that this separation would prevent wash water and associated cleaning products from entering the surrounding groundwater through the site's stormwater facilities.
- Questions concerning the protection of groundwater and the potential consequences of system failure were discussed in the context of the proposed wastewater collection and disposal system.

Traffic and Site Access:

- The applicant reviewed the traffic study prepared for the project, noting that the study had been undertaken even though the applicant stated that the project did not meet the applicable threshold that would ordinarily trigger a traffic study.
- The applicant reported that the proposed facility would generate fewer than 100 vehicle trips during the peak hour and identified approximately 16 vehicles during its busiest peak hour.
- The applicant stated that the traffic analysis considered trip generation, traffic conditions, crash data, and sight distance, and included information from other nearby development projects.
- The Town's independent traffic review by Lansing Engineering was discussed. The applicant reported that the review had not identified a significant operational impact from the proposed car wash but had requested additional calculations.
- The applicant stated that it had begun preparing the requested supplemental traffic information and would provide an updated analysis to the Town's traffic reviewer.
- Board members discussed the existing congestion on Route 9 and Loughberry Lake Road, including school-related traffic, the proximity of the proposed access to the middle school entrance, and the potential for vehicles to queue or interfere with traffic on the adjoining roadways.

- The applicant explained that the facility would operate differently from a tunnel-style car wash because vehicles would enter individual bays, remain stationary during the wash cycle, and leave the site after the wash was completed.
- The applicant maintained that the two-bay design and expected wash times would limit vehicle queues compared with facilities that process vehicles continuously through a tunnel.
- The proposed right-turn-only exit onto Route 9 and the connection to the adjoining northern parcel were discussed as elements of the access and circulation plan.
- Board members acknowledged that Route 9 is under NYSDOT jurisdiction and that certain potential roadway improvements, including traffic signals or turning-lane modifications, would require State review and approval.

Noise, Operating Hours, and Neighborhood Buffering:

- The applicant addressed concerns regarding noise from the washing equipment, vacuums, vehicle activity, and customer use.
- The applicant reiterated that operating hours had been reduced to 7:00 a.m. through 8:00 p.m.
- The applicant reviewed the proposed fence and staggered landscaping along the residential property boundary, including the proposed Norway spruce trees.
- The applicant also discussed the relocation of the vacuum area and the proposed fencing and landscaping around that area as measures intended to reduce potential impacts on adjoining properties.
- Board members discussed the proximity of residential properties and the need to consider noise, lighting, and the overall compatibility of the proposed use with the surrounding neighborhood.
- The applicant referenced a comparable two-bay touch-free car wash in a residential setting as an example of a similar operation.

Parking, Vehicle Queuing, and Zoning Classification:

- Questions were raised regarding the number of parking and stacking spaces required for the proposed facility.
- The applicant explained that the parking requirement applicable to the proposed use was based on employee parking, and that one employee parking space had been identified between the two wash bays.
- The applicant distinguished the vehicle-stacking requirement from employee parking and explained that the stacking requirement was designed to account for different types of car washes, including larger tunnel-style facilities.
- The applicant acknowledged that the applicable stacking standard would result in a requirement of 20 spaces per day, or 40 spaces in total, and stated that approximately 12 stacking spaces could be accommodated on the proposed site.
- The applicant indicated that it intended to request relief from the stacking requirement during the subsequent site plan review process.
- Board members also discussed whether a standalone car wash falls within the Town Code's definition of a service station and whether the use should instead be evaluated under a separate classification.
- The applicant's representative referenced the prior Zoning Board of Appeals review and the variances already granted. The question of the appropriate Code classification remained an issue for further clarification.

Board Discussion and Action:

- Board members discussed the substantial public participation at the hearing and the concerns raised regarding traffic safety, groundwater, water consumption, noise, neighborhood character, and the applicable zoning standards.
- Several Board members stated that the additional information provided by the applicant was helpful but that the application required further review before a decision could be made.
- Board members emphasized the importance of considering the public comments and reviewing the technical information rather than making a decision based solely on the information presented during the meeting.
- The Board discussed the applicant's outstanding traffic calculations and the need to review the additional information requested by the Town's traffic reviewer.
- The Board also discussed the need to clarify the appropriate zoning classification and to continue evaluating the applicable Special Use Permit criteria.
- Chairman Rice summarized the Board's position that no decision would be made on the Special Use Permit at this meeting. The Board intended to continue its consideration at the next monthly meeting after reviewing the information presented.
- No motion to approve or deny the Special Use Permit was made, and no final action was taken on the application.
- The Board indicated that it would make a concerted effort to address the Special Use Permit application at the next meeting.

Summary:

- The Board continued its review and discussion of the public's concerns following the public hearing. Residents had raised concerns about traffic and pedestrian safety, access to the school, neighborhood character, water use, noise, runoff, and private wells.
- The applicant is to provide additional traffic calculations and submit the updated analysis to the Town's traffic reviewer. The Board did not make a decision on the Special Use Permit.
- The proposed sidewalks are to be constructed concurrently with the project. Any elevation or drainage conflicts with the existing NYSDOT drainage easement are to be resolved.

Action Taken: No action was taken on the Special Use Permit. The application is expected to return for further consideration at the next monthly meeting.

C. 158 Traver Road Residential Subdivision – RJ Long

Application for conceptual subdivision review for a conventional four-lot subdivision at 158 Traver Road on approximately 3.65 acres, Tax Map Nos. 127.-2-28.11 and -49; zoned R-1. The proposal also involves area variance(s).

Brien Ragone of EDP is here to represent the Traver Road four lot subdivision application.

Summary:

- The Board reviewed the proposed conventional four-lot subdivision and discussed the shared driveway and access arrangements.
- The Board discussed potential headlight impacts to the property across Traver Road. The applicant is to contact the neighboring property owner to discuss concerns and possible mitigation.

- The subdivision easement is to be revised so that it extends across the full frontage of Lots 3 and 4.

Action Taken: The Board approved the Conceptual Subdivision. A Public Hearing was set for Wednesday, November 18, 2026. The motion was made by Mr. Murphy, seconded by Mr. Gabay; the motion carried.

D. 683 Saratoga Road Planned Unit Development – 683 Saratoga Road, LLC

Application for conceptual site-plan review for a mixed-use residential and commercial development at 683 Saratoga Road (Route 9), on approximately 30.99 acres, Tax Map No. 140.-3-9; zoned RB-1.

Scott Lansing of Lansing Engineering is here to represent the 683 Saratoga Road application.

Summary:

- The proposal includes seven residential buildings containing a total of 53 condominium units and two three-story mixed-use buildings, each with a 7,500-square-foot footprint and 15 apartments per building.
- The conceptual plan includes approximately 1,600 feet of sidewalk and two proposed crosswalks. The applicant is to begin coordination with NYSDOT regarding design and permitting.
- Project includes a proposed land dedication to the Town of 21.85 acres.

Action Taken: The Board approved the Conceptual Site Plan for the 683 Saratoga Road Project. Mr. Rifenbary made a motion, seconded by Mr. Murphy; the motion carried.

E. Forest Grove Subdivision, Phase 3A/B – Forest Grove, LLC

Application to amend the subdivision to reconfigure lots and lot types within Phases 3A and 3B, located on Daintree Drive and Wistmans Way, on approximately 565.3 acres; zoned R-2.

Brien Ragone of EDP is here to represent Forest Grove subdivision application.

- The Board reviewed the proposed lot and lot-type reconfiguration for Phases 3A and 3B.
- The Board discussed the subdivision amendment associated with the revised phase layout and the transfer of development rights. Traffic-calming measures and trail details were also raised during the broader Forest Grove discussion.

Action Taken: The Board approved the Amended Subdivision for the 683 Saratoga Road Project. Mr. Rifenbary made a motion, seconded by Mr. Murphy; the motion carried.

F. Forest Grove Subdivision, Phase 3C–E – Forest Grove, LLC

Pre-application for reconfiguring lots and lot types within Phases 3C–E to incorporate the 20 lots approved through the transfer of development rights (TDR), for a proposed subdivision total of 441 lots. The property is located on Jones Road, Putnam Lane, Bullard Lane, and Scout Road, on approximately 565.3 acres; zoned R-2.

Brien Ragone of EDP is here to represent the Forest Grove Subdivision application.

- The Board discussed conceptual master-plan changes for Phases 3C–E to incorporate the 20 development rights transferred from Wilton Woods, bringing the overall subdivision total to approximately 441 lots.
- The proposed paved trail segment from Coville Court to the existing Forest Grove trail intersection was discussed.
- Additional traffic-calming measures were discussed on the Forest Grove network.

Action Taken: The Board approved the Conceptual Phase 3C-E- Forest Grove Project. Mr. Price made a motion, seconded by Mr. Murphy; the motion carried.

G. Exit 15 Auto Park – Country Realty Co.

Pre-application for two mixed commercial-use buildings of approximately 5,000 sq.ft. each at 3002 NYS Route 50 on approximately 20.73 acres, Tax Map No. 153.-3-84.11; zoned PUDD.

Brien Ragone of EDP is here to represent the Exit 15 Auto Park application.

- The Board reviewed a conceptual layout for two mixed commercial-use buildings of approximately 5,000 square feet each at 3002 Route 50.
- The Board discussed compliance with the existing PUD legislation. The Town Engineer requested sufficient information to evaluate permitted uses, parking requirements, and potential higher-intensity traffic scenarios.

Action Taken: The Board approved the Conceptual Exit 15 Auto Park Project. Mr. Rifenbary made a motion, seconded by Mr. Gabay; the motion carried.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The next Planning Board meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 18, 2026.

Date Approved: November 18, 2026

Amy DiLeone, Executive Secretary