

# TOWN OF WILTON

22 TRAVER ROAD

WILTON, NEW YORK

PHONE: 518-587-1939

FAX: 518-587-2837

Susan Baldwin, Town Clerk

## **PUBLIC HEARING-Proposed Local Law #1 of 2026**

683 Saratoga Road PUDD

Good evening. I'm Scott Lansing with Lansing Engineering, representing 683 Saratoga Road LLC. We're here primarily this evening for the public hearing and to request the Board's consideration for approval of the PUDD local law associated with the project.

I think the Board is quite familiar with the project. For the benefit of the public, I'll go through the background and what we're proposing.

This is a Planned Unit Development District, which is a multi-step process with the Town. It's a four-step process. We are at the third step: First, we met with this Board and obtained referral to the Planning Board.

We went to the Planning Board and had a conceptual review.

The Planning Board provided a positive recommendation back to the Town Board.

We're here this evening for a public hearing, and if all goes well, we hope this Board will consider approval of the local law for the project. After that, we would go back to the Planning Board for detailed site plan review. That's where full engineering design of the project will be done.

As for existing conditions:

The site is at 683 Saratoga Road.

The parcel is 30.99 acres (roughly 31 acres).

To the south is Hilltop Drive.

Waller Drive is roughly across the street.

SUNY Adirondack is towards the top of the drawing (north).

Zoning is RB-1 (Residential Business 1).

There is an existing 630 sq ft, two-story brick structure in the southeast corner, with smaller ancillary buildings nearby.

We have done a wetland survey. There are DEC wetlands in the central portion of the project.

The parcel is primarily wooded.

What we're proposing:

We're proposing development on the front portion of the parcel, roughly 5–6 acres. The balance of the property is proposed for preservation, which I'll discuss in a bit.

First, the existing historic structure in the southeast corner will be retained. The ancillary buildings around it are proposed to be demolished.

We are proposing a mix of uses:

Mixed-Use Buildings (Front of Site)

At the front we have two buildings, each a 3-story commercial/retail + apartment building:

Each building: 7,500 sq ft

First floor (per building):

6,500 sq ft of retail/commercial space

1,500 sq ft of amenity space

Total:

~13,000 sq ft of retail/commercial

~3,000 sq ft of amenity space

Second and third floors of each building are apartments:

15 apartments per building,

30 apartments total across the two buildings.

Condominium Buildings (Rear of Developed Area)

In the back portion of the developed area (still front part of parcel), we're proposing seven condominium buildings:

10 units per building,

3-story buildings,

Footprint roughly 5,100 sq ft per building.

Mix of 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom units.

Each unit will have a garage, so 10 garages per building. Every condo unit has an attached garage.

These are proposed as owner-occupied units, targeting young professionals, retirees, empty nesters, and seniors.

From a market standpoint, the applicants see the condos as a mid-price option in the Town of Wilton. Apartments provide a rental option, but not ownership. Single-family homes in the area are significantly higher priced; a starter new-construction single-family home is likely \$650,000–\$700,000. The applicants are proposing to price these condos somewhere in the \$400,000s.

We're also proposing a 4-lot subdivision: Lot with the existing historic structure;

Lot with one mixed-use (commercial + apartment) building;

Lot with the second mixed-use building;

Lot with the balance of the property (condos + preserved open space).

Proposed Uses & Amenities

Commercial Uses (Ground Floor)

Uses will include those allowed in RB-1, plus some specifically described examples:

Retail / Essential Services

Small-scale grocery store (under 2,500 sq ft to maintain neighborhood scale)

Convenience/general store

Specialty food & drink: bakeries, coffee shops, ice cream parlors, wine & liquor stores

Personal Services

Barber shops

Beauty salons

Spas

Laundromats

Dining & Social

Local restaurants and cafés

Bars and taverns

Breakfast spots

Professional & Creative Offices

Real estate, law, insurance, accounting offices

Medical / Dental / Veterinary

Medical and dental clinics

Health care providers

Veterinary offices (no boarding)

Arts & Specialty Retail

Artistic workshops

Art galleries

Antique shops

Studios for craftsmen and artists

Sidewalks & Trails

We're proposing:

Sidewalks throughout the project, connecting:

Residential units to the retail/commercial areas;

A sidewalk along Saratoga Road frontage.

Extended sidewalks:

North toward The Canopy

South toward Hilltop Drive

Total frontage sidewalk length ~1,600 feet.

We're also proposing two crosswalks on Route 9:

One by Waller Drive, to help people cross Route 9 safely.

One up near SUNY Adirondack.

Inside the site, we're proposing a trail system:

A trail from the developed area back to the pond in the rear

Then meandering through the back portion of the parcel and looping back.

Open Space Preservation

As noted, only the front 5–6 acres are being developed. The balance of roughly 31 acres is proposed to be permanently preserved as open space. That includes the pond and wooded/wetland areas in the rear.

Architecture & Roads

We showed some sample architecture to indicate what the applicant wants to emulate:

3-story buildings facing Saratoga Road;

Garages on the opposite side, not facing the road.

Roadways:

All internal roads are proposed as private.

Nothing is proposed to be dedicated to the Town, so no Town maintenance.

Roads will be owned, operated, and maintained by the condo association and commercial property owners.

Utilities & Stormwater

Public water: Wilton Water & Sewer Authority

Public sewer: Saratoga County Sewer District

Stormwater: managed on site.

We're at step 3 of 4 in the PUDD process. We've worked with Town Board and Planning Board; refined the PUD legislation; added mixed-use buildings at the front at the Town's request; extended sidewalk connections (previously just frontage, now extended north and south); and created a phasing plan for sidewalks:

Phase 1: sidewalks around the residential units and northward

Phase 2: sidewalks southward

Commercial frontage sidewalks to be built when the commercial buildings are constructed, to avoid damage if poured earlier.

We were also asked to revisit the front yard setback:

Originally 25 feet, typical for nearby zones.

We moved it back to 42 feet while maintaining parking and buffers.

We provided renderings and black-and-white site layouts showing the difference between 25 ft and 42 ft setbacks.

We're here tonight for questions and comments from the Board and public, and we would like your support and consideration for approval of the local law.

**(Steve Bederian of Wilton )**

My question is about the commercial uses. Most of the ground floor is commercial with apartments above.

Looking at our neighbors to the south, a lot of those commercial spaces are vacant, and the issue is fit-up cost for small businesses. Will there be some sort of fund or allowance to deal with fit-up costs for these retail spaces?

**Scott Lansing**

We're proposing about 13,000 sq ft of commercial space between the two buildings, divided into smaller tenant spaces. We hope that supports neighborhood-type businesses.

In terms of total volume, this is a relatively small amount of commercial space compared to the rest of the Route 9 corridor. The applicants believe they can lease this space, with support from the condo residents and apartment residents, which should help make it successful.

On fit-ups: I can't give firm details, but generally, landlords often work with tenants—they may amortize fit-up costs into the lease term or offer allowances. That would be handled case by case by the building owners.

**Supervisor Sturm**

So you're saying that fit-up would be a matter left to the individual owner of each commercial parcel?

**Scott Lansing**

Yes. Whoever owns the building typically offers some support—allowances or contributions to fit-up—to attract tenants.

Toni Sturm

And that's part of why we pushed for apartments above: to increase the financial feasibility of the commercial space.

**Councilwoman Kollgian**

I can attest being a commercial landlord, tenants don't pay for their fit out 95% of the time it's advertised or there's an allowance, because as a landlord, we want them to be there and paying rent, so you invest in their space to help them be there and grow. And then the amortization he's talking about, if it, you know, if it goes above and beyond an allotment per square foot, it can be, you know, it's divided out amongst the length of their lease, whether it be five, 710, 15 years.

**Steve Bederian** asked: What is the plan for the existing building again?

**Scott Lansing**

Right now, it has a permit to be a bed and breakfast. At the moment it's just rented as a single-family residence. The applicant plans to continue operating it that way—as a single-family residence, or as a bed and breakfast if

that opportunity comes up under the existing permit. But that's not really the main focus of this application right now.

**John McEachron**

The purpose of the square-footage limit we put in the law was to prevent medical and dental buildings. Basically, what happens is when the owner can't rent these spaces to the "mom and pop" shops, they revert to medical and dental.

That's why that square-footage change was put in our zoning. Somehow, it looks like that provision got bypassed here. I'm not sure—the number seems like it grew. When they can't find tenants, they come back and say they've tried to rent it for a year and no one's interested because of the fit-up costs. That's when medical and dental comes into play, and in my opinion, you just end up with more medical buildings.

**Scott Kingsley**

Who will be responsible for snow clearing and general maintenance of the sidewalks? Will it be the business owners along the storefront, or the condo homeowners association?

**Scott Lansing**

For the sidewalks within the project, it will be a mix. For the sidewalks along the frontage, my understanding is that the Town requires owners to maintain the sidewalk in front of their specific property. So along the entire frontage, that will be maintained by those individual owners.

For the interior sidewalks, that will be the condominium association. It will be part of their dues, and that's how that will be maintained.

**Supervisor Sturm**

One of the questions—or items—I'd like to discuss is that acceptance of this PUDD is conditional upon a couple of additional items. One would be to place the 42-foot front setback language in the PUDD itself.

Could I just follow up on John's comment? I'm wondering: what is the square-footage allotment he's describing—what is that clause that exists to limit the square footage that would be attractive to large medical/dental facilities?

That provision likely exists in the Hamlet Zone, not here. It was designed to keep the Hamlet more walkable and "mom and pop" oriented.

**Deputy Supervisor Rohan**

So it only applies to those Hamlet Zones, which this is not, correct?

**Mr. Riper**

Correct. It's in the Hamlet Zone.

**John McEachron**

The Hamlet was reduced down to the PDD density levels. The Hamlet's density is now the same as the rest of the Town. So I would say the same rules should have applied here. But that must be another loophole we missed.

**Mr. Riper** With a PUDD, they can create their own zoning for the site—setbacks, side yards, front setbacks, creation of parcels—however they want to develop it, subject to Town Board approval.

Deputy Supervisor **Rohan**

What I'm trying to be crystal clear on is this: the commercial space limits John is talking about—those exist in the Hamlet Zone, correct? Hypothetically, a PUDD could go around that anyway, but in this case it doesn't even apply, because the clause he's describing only applies in the Hamlet Zone, which this is not. Correct?

Correct. It's in the Hamlet Zone.

**John McEachron**

Right, but the Hamlet was reduced down to the PDD density levels. The Hamlet's density is now the same as the rest of town. I would say the same rules should have applied here, too. That must be another loophole we missed.

**Mr. Riper**

Exactly. Through a PUDD, they can propose different setbacks and parcel configurations than what's in the underlying zoning.

**John McEachron**

That's a good point. But that only answers one piece: what happens when they can't fill the small retail spaces?

**Scott Kingsley**

When they can't up-fit the properties?

**Deputy Supervisor Rohan**

Right. And I think that's a good point. The clause you're describing probably should be more broadly applied in town, not just in the Hamlet, to prevent over-concentration of big dental and medical facilities.

**Councilwoman Kolligian**

I'm just confused why we're so focused on medical and dental. Is this just because it's on Route 9 frontage? The Hamlet rules were changed to encourage walkability and more mom-and-pop uses there.

But this site is outside the Hamlet. There's already medical nearby, there's a medical office next door, and another across the street. What exactly is the issue with medical here?

**John McEachron**

When they can't find these bakeries, barbershops, coffee shops, cafés and restaurants—just like in the Hamlet—they revert to medical. That's what will most likely happen.

If the developer just down the road, a hundred yards away, couldn't fill his spaces with barber shops and coffee shops and cafés and restaurants, if he couldn't do it, I don't see why this would be different.

**Galen Hench**

Is that pond currently there?

**Supervisor Sturm**

Yes, it is.

**Galen Hench**

Is there a plan to ensure that runoff or leftover construction materials don't end up flowing back into the pond once the community is built? Is there a stormwater management plan?

**Scott Lansing**

Yes. There will be a full Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) developed for this project as part of the final step, when we return to the Planning Board.

We'll work with the Town Engineer on a full stormwater management plan in compliance with NYS DEC standards.

It will address:

Water quality

Water quantity

Pre- and post-development conditions.

No other questions or comments were brought up for public hearing.

On a motion introduced by Deputy Supervisor Rohan and seconded by Councilman O’Conor, the public hearing was closed at 7:24 p.m.

**PUBLIC HEARING-Proposed Local Law #2 of 2026**

Amending Chapter 43-17 of the Wilton Town Code to provide  
For collection of enforcement expenses as a result of violations of the Town Code

There were no questions or comments.

On a motion introduced by Deputy Supervisor Rohan and seconded by Councilman O’Conor, the public hearing was closed at 7:25.

**REGULAR TOWN BOARD MEETING**

Supervisor Sturm welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 7:25 p.m.

**Pledge of Allegiance**

**Roll Call**

Roll Call by the Town Clerk showed the following board members present:

- Toni Sturm-Supervisor
- Connor Rohan-Councilman
- Joe Keneally-Councilman
- Erinn Kolligian-Councilwoman
- Ray O’Conor-Councilman

Also present was Ryan K. Riper, P. E., Director of Planning and Engineering, Maria Moran, CPA, Comptroller and Mark Schachner, Town Counsel.

**Public Comment**

*Good evening, my name is Kristyn Allen, and I live at 714 Wilton Gansevoort Road.  
For the record, I’ve previously addressed this matter, found in the November 6, 2025 Town Board meeting minutes, outlining years of unresolved code violations at 716 Wilton Gansevoort Road.  
Tonight, I am here because despite a formal Town Board motion on March 5 to initiate Supreme Court action, a case has still not been filed.  
At this stage, the issue is not awareness, information, or authority. It's execution.*

*This matter has already experienced multiple procedural failures involving Town attorneys, including two dismissed Town Court cases—one due to incorrect code citations, and another due to attorney non-appearance.*

*These breakdowns have already cost time, taxpayer-funded resources, and meaningful progress.*

*And yet, despite those outcomes—and despite the involvement of multiple Town attorneys, including at the partner level—this matter has once again stalled at the point of initiation.*

*For nearly a year, I have been told by Town officials that next steps are dependent on the Town attorney. But deferral without clear direction, timelines, and follow-up is not a process—it is a pattern. Direction framed in open-ended terms such as "earliest convenience" does not establish expectations for timely action.*

*I was recently informed that the anticipated timeline for filing may extend an additional two weeks.*

*Given the Board's prior action and the history of this matter, that extension is not consistent with the urgency this situation warrants.*

*Court timelines may be outside of the Town's control—but initiation is not. It is the basic first step—not complex litigation strategy—and delaying it under that premise is difficult to justify where the violations are already clearly established.*

*A filed case, an assigned index number, and timely service are the actions that signal this matter is actually moving forward. Four weeks from a well-documented and Board-approved motion is a reasonable timeframe for that to occur, and it has not.*

*This is especially concerning given that I previously endured over a year of daily sewage odors from this property—conditions that only stopped after work not sanctioned by the Town was performed and described as a temporary fix expected to fail.*

*Residents like me should not have to prompt movement at every stage of code enforcement—especially in matters involving septic failure and sustained runoff conditions that have affected my property daily for the last three years—yet that's exactly what I've had to do.*

*At this point, what is most concerning is not just this delay, but the normalization of delay from Town Counsel while the impacts of this situation continue to fall on the affected property owner. The pattern of procedural failures—which again, includes a Town attorney failing to appear in court—as well as years of code violations with no consequence, are unacceptable.*

*This pattern creates a precedent for inaction at the expense of residents.*

*Accountability means more than passing a motion.*

*It means ensuring that action follows—promptly and without requiring continued intervention from affected residents—particularly when the primary obstacle is no longer the violation itself, but the failure of Town Counsel to carry Board-authorized enforcement forward through initiation.*

### **Approve Pending Minutes**

On a motion introduced by Councilman O’Conor, the board adopted the following resolutions:

#### **RESOLUTION #123**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve the minutes from the January 8, 2026 meeting, as typed.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, duly put to a vote, all in favor the motion passed 5-0.

### **Proposed LL#1 of 2026 683 Saratoga Road PUDD**

Supervisor Sturm said the next item is regarding the public hearing: proposed Local Law Number 1 of 2026, a PUD at 683 Saratoga Road. She said there are a couple of issues and suggested that the acceptance of this PUDD is conditional upon:

Number one: documenting the current 42-foot front yard setback actually in the PUD language.

Number two: would be putting some kind of sunset clause on the PUD approval that if planning and plan approval doesn’t happen within a certain amount of time, the PUDD would expire. Deputy Supervisor Rohan asked if there is a statutory provision? Mr. Riper said for site plan review there is, but if the Town Board approves the PUD language, that would still hold as a use. Attorney Schachner said there’s no sunset on the on the legislation itself.

Mr. Riper asked if the board wants to put the sunset clause on if the project does not develop and start construction at a certain point, four or five years down the road. Councilwoman Kolligian asked if it was upon final approval? Mr. Riper said yes, after final approval.

Councilwoman Kolligian asked can we do that? Attorney Schachner said he thought that was different than what the Supervisor had in mind. He said he thinks what the Supervisor had in mind was: if the legislation—the Planned Unit Development District legislation—is approved, it must be in existence within X amount of time after that, or the zoning amendment would lapse.

Supervisor Sturm said yes, that’s what she was referring to. Mr. Riper asked would they start construction? Attorney Schachner said it depends what you’re saying in the legislation... except that once rights have vested—once they commence—you can’t then revoke it out. That’s the distinction.

Where the clock starts is the issue: does it start from adoption of the zoning amendment (which is what a Planned Unit Development District is: a zoning amendment), or upon site plan approval.

Mr. Riper said it's just something that would then require the applicant to come back for an extension or it just expires

Councilwoman Kolligian said we know sometimes how long a site plan process could be in front of the Planning Board. You always hope it's only going to be maybe six months, but would want to start the clock now and then the Planning Board could take a year. We shouldn't start the clock until they're stamped and approved because they have to get their finances in order, and then: at what stage are you commencing that? The clearing of the property could happen, does that count? Does that start the clock over again?

If it takes a year to clear, look what happened over on Route 50, right? They cleared it, and now nothing's happening. She said she thinks we need to be very clear on what that sunset looks like and what stages of completion.

Councilman Keneally said he thinks it would be fair to be on completion of the approval process.

Supervisor Sturm asked, the approval of the site plan? Councilman Keneally say yes, not passing the PUDD.

Councilman O'Connor said, assuming that the Planning Board would take at least six months he would be inclined to put a sunset/expiration date for some time period after Planning Board approval, whether that's six months from that time.

Mr. Riper said they do have in the PUD legislation that it's anticipated that construction will start 24 months after approval, assuming that's for financing. You would probably be at least beyond 24 months after Planning Board approval. That's just a suggestion.

Attorney Schachner said to make sure the board is making a fully informed decision: understand that and again, he said he has no opinion on this, but if you structure the expiration as you're describing, then if, for any reason and didn't know what the reason could be; there could be a number of reasons, the applicant never achieves site plan approval, then the zoning amendment stays in place forever.

Deputy Supervisor Rohan said it could be a sub-clause where, if this property doesn't get Planning Board approval, then it expires in a certain amount of time

Councilwoman Kolligian said it would go back to the original zoning. Attorney Schachner said that's exactly what he thought the board was contemplating: where to draw that line.

Attorney Schachner said typically, there are two ways you can deal with the expiration:

1. It reverts to the zoning at the time of Planned Development District creation; or
2. If it doesn't happen by whatever date you pick, it becomes zoned A, B, or whatever zone the board chooses.

Councilwoman Kolligian said we also need to determine, if we set a sunset clause and they're not, you know, they're not anticipating starting for 24 months, what is the sunset? Do they have five years to start the project, or do they have five years to complete the project? That's quick to move on a project this big, hopefully it moves right along, but in the next few years you have an economy to contend with, interest rates, and all that kind of stuff. Are we talking that they need to start the project by then, or it needs—are we setting the sunset for completion?

Attorney Schachner said he does have a legal opinion on that issue. It's a little risky to have it targeted to completion, because you don't want to change midstream once underway. He said he would not recommend that.

Councilman O'Connor said if you look at a project like Forest Grove it will take years, many years to complete that. And to Councilwoman Kolligian's point about: who knows where the economy, interest rates, or anything else is going at this point? In the PUDD legislation it says that they will start construction within 24 months. That's anticipated, and it's in phases. Phase One was the 3 x 10-unit condos, and Phase Two was 4 x 10 units, Phase Three would be the mixed-use building. It is planned in phases, and that will take some time. Once they start substantial construction, that would be the point. The board could make it four years from now for Phase One to begin.

Councilwoman Kolligian asked if we then put a sunset in that they have 24 months for Phase Two to begin?

Mr. Riper said no, once it starts. Councilman O’Conor said construction to commence 24 months after final approval by the Planning Board. If the project is not approved or is disapproved by the Planning Board, then the property would revert to its original zoning. Attorney Schachner said that’s Planning Board site plan approval.

Councilwoman Sturm asked if they don’t have the Planning Board site plan approval within 24 months, then the PUD would expire? Councilwoman Kolligian said no. If the Planning Board chooses not to approve this project, it becomes null and void, and the property goes back to its original zone. Councilman O’Conor said it is two different things. That was Step One. Step Two was 24 months if approved, from the site plan final approval. Twenty-four months would be the start of construction clock. Supervisor Sturm said that it’s already written in the code, that the site plan approval basically will expire if construction doesn’t begin within 24 months.

Councilman O’Conor said we’re saying not just the site plan will expire, but the underlying zoning revision that we’re making today reverts back to the original land use.

Mr. Riper said that way the PUDD, if this all dissolves, they could have site plan approval, and then site plan approval goes away; they lose that. But the PUDD would still be in place. Or, if the Planning Board chooses not to go through the process and the PUD would still in place

Attorney Schachner said he thought Councilman O’Conor was envisioning that after a certain amount of time, if the second approval hasn’t happened, it would revert back to the original zoning. Councilman O’Conor said that was correct.

Councilman O’Conor said two things will revert this back to the original zoning:

1. The Planning Board does not approve;
2. Construction does not commence within 24 months if they approve.

Deputy Supervisor Rohan said he would also like our motion to approve to be conditioned upon Town Council review and approval as well.

Attorney Schachner said the way Councilman O’Conor just last stated it, there could be a lapse of an infinite amount of time, because the Planning Board hasn’t rejected it and hasn’t made a decision. And the zoning would stay in place until and unless the Planning Board denied site plan, if that is what he understood what Councilman O’Conor said. It did not sound consistent with the intention .

The “what if” is: zoning amendment is approved, and for whatever reason the Planning Board site plan review process does not proceed very expeditiously, and it sits there and sits there and sits there and sits there. It hasn’t been denied by the Planning Board. The zoning stays in place until and unless something happens.

Deputy Supervisor Rohan said what we are trying to avoid is a period in which there’s ambiguity in the zoning.

Councilman O’Conor said if there is an extraordinary delay in the planning process, nothing’s going to happen on that property anyway. Nobody’s throwing a shovel in the ground—unless the Planning Board approves it.

If the Planning Board just ignores it for the next five years, it doesn’t matter if the PUD legislation stays in place.

Supervisor Sturm said she thought that was one of two issues that the sunset clause would address:

1. That the PUD lapses if construction does not commence within 24 months of Planning Board site approval; and
2. The second circumstance would be if Planning Board approval does not occur within X number of months.

Otherwise, it can sit in limbo forever, and the PUD sits in limbo forever. Attorney Schachner said that is why he wanted to make sure everyone understood. Councilman O’Conor said if the project is not approved, nothing is

going to happen on it. There is no risk. Councilwoman Kolligian said it gives the planning board time to do their due diligence. We should never put a time constraint on them doing what they need to do for a proper project. However long it take, once the planning board decides to make that final approval, the clock starts for the 24 months time for the commencement of the first phase of the construction. If the planning process drags out for two or three years, it's undeveloped. We could give them five years to complete the project but it puts a time constraint on the planning process and said she didn't think it was proper.

On a motion introduced by Councilman O'Connor, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #124**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve Local Law #1 of 2026, 683 Saratoga Road PUDD with the following conditions and subject to review and approval of Town Counsel and Director of Planning and Engineering:

1. After final Planning Board approval (if granted), the applicant will have 24 months to achieve substantial commencement of construction of Phase 1.
2. All building shall have a minimum front yard setback of forty two feet (42').
3. If the Planning Board denies site plan approval, the subject property will revert to its original underlying zoning, thereby nullifying the PUDD.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0.

Supervisor Sturm said another condition is about the rear portion of the property. The current PUDD language says it will be dedicated to the homeowner's association. After discussions with Saratoga PLAN and our staff, we would like that rear portion to ultimately be conveyed to the Town to help facilitate trail connections and long-term conservation.

Mr. Riper said we would need to work out a boundary line between the developed area and the area to be conveyed and adjust acreages accordingly. That would come back to this Board, similar to how we treat cluster We'd need to work out a boundary line between the developed area and the area to be conveyed and adjust acreages accordingly. That would come back to this Board, similar to how we treat cluster subdivision open space.

On a motion introduced by Councilman O’Conor, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #125**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to express the intent to accept the donated rear property (open-space portion) of 683 Saratoga Road PUDD TMN , subject to review by Town Engineer, Town Council and subsequent review by the Town Board.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilwoman Kolligian, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0.

The Town Clerk noted we received a letter from the Town of Greenfield Planning Board noticing that they have received and reviewed the public notice hearing for tonight regarding the proposed project at 683 Saratoga road for a planned development district to allow construction of two, three story mixed use buildings along Saratoga Road, seven 10, unit condominium buildings behind the proposed mixed use buildings. After initial review during our March 31 planning board meeting, the Board determined that there appears to be no planning or inter municipal concerns from the town of Greenfield.

Mr. Riper said the veterinarian just to the north visited town hall today. He did not make it tonight, and. He reviewed the plans and had no issues with the plan.

**Proposed LL#2 of 2026 Amending Chapter 43-17 of the Town Code**

On a motion introduced by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #126**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve Local Law #2 of 2026, the Amendment to Chapter 43-17 of the Town Code to provide for collection of enforcement expenses as a result of violations of the Town Code.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0.

**Klepetar Conservation Easement**

On a motion introduced by Councilman O’Conor, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #127**

**WHEREAS**, the Saratoga County Farmland/Open Space Preservation Program was established as a matching fund grant program to purchase development or other rights or outright ownership of productive agriculture and open space land; and

**WHEREAS**, Resolutions 282-2021 and 307-2025 authorized the Saratoga County Board of Supervisor to award the Town of Wilton the sum of \$95,000 upon the condition of Saratoga PLAN completing a bargain sale, plus in-kind donation , toward an appraised value of \$500,000, for the purchase of developments rights of 444 acres of mature hardwoods in order to place a perpetual conservation easement over the Klepetar Family Forest II, (TMN 114.-1-61 and 113.-1-42);

**NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS AGREED** that upon receipt of proof of Saratoga PLAN’s completion of the above-described acquisition of purchased development rights over the Klepetar Family Forest Parcels I and II and receipt of proof of remittance from the TOWN to Saratoga PLAN for the amount of \$95,000 the COUNTY will issue a payment to the TOWN in the total amount of \$95,000; and be it further

**AGREED**, that the Deeds shall contain conservation easements that the land shall be hod in perpetuity for agriculture, open space, recreation , or park purposes; and be it further

**AGREED**, that the TOWN shall deliver to the COUNTY a copy of the executed original Deeds, with evidence of its recording in the Office of the Saratoga County Clerk.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilwoman Kolligian, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0.

**Contract with Saratoga County Sheriff's Department**

On a motion introduced by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #128**

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to Resolution 283-2024, this Board authorized an agreement with the Town of Wilton for the provision of law enforcement services by the Saratoga County Sheriff's Office for a term on one (1) year, commencing January 1, 2025; and

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Wilton wished to enter into a new agreement for the provision of law enforcement services by the Sheriff's Office in 2026; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed agreement, commencing January 1, 2026 and expiring December 31, 2026, includes reimbursement by the Town of Wilton for all County-incurred expenses, including salaries, benefits training, patrol cars, and all associated transportation expenses; and

**WHEREAS**, our Public Safety Committee and the Sheriff have recommended that the County enter into an agreement with the Town of Wilton for the provision of law enforcement services for a term on one (1) year, commencing January 1, 2026 and expiring December 31, 2026; now, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED**, that the Chair of the Board of Supervisors is hereby authorized to execute an agreement with the Town of Wilton, in an amount of \$142,523.85, for the provision of law enforcement service for a term of one (1) year, commencing January

1, 2026 and expiring December 31, 2026, pursuant to the following:

**Number of Patols-1**  
**Service Time of Patrols-8:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m.**  
**Monday-Friday**  
**Service Area-The entire Town of Wilton**  
**Amount-\$142,523.85**

;and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that the Sheriff's Office shall provide such law enforcement services to the Town of Wilton for added patrols and/or special detail assignments as determined by the Sheriff, the cost of which services shall be included within the stated amount of the agreement; and be in further

**RESOLVED**, that the Sheriff shall have the right to modify the foregoing schedule based upon the changing needs of law enforcement withing the Town of Wilton; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that the form and content of such agreement shall be subject to the approval of the County Attorney.

**Contract for Compliance Engine Software**

On a motion introduced by Councilman O'Connor, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #129**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve the contract for Compliance Engine Software for the Building Department to track commercial fire inspections.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0.

**Resignation-Board of Assessment Review**

On a motion introduced by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #130**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** to accept the resignation of Jay Rifenburg from the Zoning Board of Appeals, effective immediately.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilman O'Connor, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0.

**Resignation Zoning Board of Appeals**

On a motion introduced by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #131**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** to accept the resignation of Glenn Allen from the Board of Assessment Review effective immediately.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilman O'Connor, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0.

**Appointment-Zoning Board of Appeals**

On a motion introduced by Councilman Rohan, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #132**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** to approve the appointment Keith Kaplan to the Zoning Board of Appeals

4/2/2026-12/31/2026 to serve Jay Rifenbary's unexpired term.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilman O'Connor, duly put to a vote, all in favor, except Councilwoman Kolligian, who abstained. The motion passed 4-0.

**Resolution of Support for Bill A09293 WWSA to relevy unpaid water bills**

On a motion introduced by Councilman O'Connor, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #133**

**WHEREAS**, each year the Town of Wilton Water and Sewer Authority (WWSA) writes off thousands of dollars in uncollected water and sewer rates, fees and charges due to nonpayment of water bills; and

**WHEREAS**, such uncollected rates and charges automatically become a lien on the property which are usually only paid upon the sale of the property, causing the Town to wait for long periods of time before it can collect such payment; and

**WHEREAS**, the WWSA is a public benefit corporation under New York State Law created under Article 5 of the NYS Public Authorities Law, Title 6-C, Sections 1121-1146 (1991); and

**WHEREAS**, New York Assembly Bill A.9293, an act to amend the Public Authorities Law in relation to method of collection of charges by the WWSA, was introduced on December 10, 2025; and

**WHEREAS**, this bill would allow the Town to collect overdue water and sewer payments annually as part of the payment of property taxes;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, the WWSA fully and unconditionally endorses and supports Assembly Bill A9293; and it is further

**RESOLVED**, that the WWSA requests that the New York State Assembly adopt A9293; and the Governor to sign the same into law; and it is lastly

**RESOLVED**, that the WWSA is authorized and directed to execute any other documents necessary to advance the Assembly Bill.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilwoman Kolligian, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0

**Request from WWPP-Demolition of Building-Camp Saratoga**

This item was tabled for additional information on time and cost.

**Request for Alcohol Waiver-WWPP Camp Saratoga Fundraiser on 5/28/2026**

On a motion introduced by Councilman O’Conor, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #134**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve the alcohol waiver for Wilton Wildlife Preserve and Park on May 28, 2026 from 5:00 pm to 8:00 pm.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilwoman Kolligian, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0.

**Request for Alcohol Waiver-Gavin Park VCHC Community Event 7/11/2026**

On a motion introduced by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #135**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** to approve the alcohol waiver for Veterans and Community Housing Coalition Community Event on July 11, 2026 from 11:00 am to 2:00 pm.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilwoman Kolligian, duly put to a vote, all in favor except Councilman O'Connor who abstained. The motion passed 4-0.

### **Senior Center Director Position**

Councilwoman Kolligian said a current senior that's over there, Judy Shin, has offered to step in as the director. She is their current treasurer, she's prepared to step down from that role, and they have a new treasurer ready to come in, should she be appointed tonight. She said she and Nancy Riely went to the Senior Center to chat with all them, and they would like to have some more days and hours. We agreed upon the first and third Thursday of the month with the same hours, because Greenfield is the second and fourth Thursday. And there were some Greenfield resident seniors there. So the thought was, why don't we do the opposite? And it will open Mondays and Tuesdays from Tuesdays from 10:00 am to 2:00 pm. Scott Harrington has been helping keep it unlocked and locked up and ensure everything is shut down, shut off. The extra two days a month would be that same time frame.

It would keep it under 17 hours a week, which is what we need to make sure we maintain that for a part time position. She said she and Maria are going to sit down with them next Tuesday, Judy in that new capacity, if she gets approved tonight, but we're still going to go over anyway and kind of delineate what is the town budget responsibilities and the senior center, because they really are a completely separate entity with their own board. She said she and Nancy Riely also shared their bylaws with them, which are not even close to what's happening. They're going to work on that. She said she offered to help where she could but, it's very separate, so it's something that they're going to also have to address. They only have two people on their board. There's supposed to be 12, but there's not even 12 people over there, so they're going to need to make some amendments, which they are aware of. We're just trying to clean that up a little bit, so they're going to work on their bylaws. She said she and Maria are going to go over next Tuesday and just delineate what's our responsibility, what's their responsibility, especially with that new budget items from the county where they doubled the bus and the food contract to \$8,200 each. We want to make sure that our seniors are aware. For seniors, we're not sure if it's delivery or if they go to certain locations, we're working on that, but to make sure that as long as we're paying the \$16,500 a year for both, that the seniors are aware that those are opportunities they can use.

### **Yellow Ribbon Day Collection Box**

Supervisor Sturm said the next item is just an informational. Yellow ribbon day for our troops is Thursday, April 9. There's been a collection box out in the hallway for small personal care items, toiletries, small food items. There's a list just above the box that lists the kind of items. You can also make a gift card donation, and this is to support our troops.

**Fee Waiver for Abigal Jenks Memorial Day Ruck**

On a motion introduced by Councilwoman Kolligian, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #136**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve the fee waiver for the Abigal Jenks Memorial Day Ruck at Gavin Park.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilman O’Conor, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0.

**Busing Contract for Summer Camp**

On a motion introduced by Councilwoman Kolligian, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #137**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve the busing contract with Saratoga Springs City School District for Gavin Park Summer Camp Transportation for \$50,000.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0.

**Committee Reports**

**Park and Recreation Committee meeting.**

There was a discussion about an incident at Gavin Park when a man went into cardiac arrest while playing basketball. The bystanders immediately started CPR, called 911, retrieved and used the on-site AED. By the time first responders arrived, he had regained a pulse and was breathing. He is now in the ICU recovering. The Board wants to formally recognize these bystanders for their heroic actions.

The AED was deployed and then taken temporarily out of service until the next morning:

EMS had to replace the pads and check the device. It was returned to service quickly.

The incident prompted discussion between Councilwoman Kolligian, Maria Moran and Nancy Riely about ensuring all town buildings have AEDs. Making sure CPR/AED training is available and up to date for multiple employees in each building, so someone trained is always likely to be present.

Expanding planning to include Narcan availability, as another life-saving intervention.

### **Internal Safety Review Committee**

There is an existing internal safety review committee. Connor Rohan is the liaison.

Nancy is actively working on items, including CPR/AED training coverage. It's noted they have AEDs in places like the courthouse and highway.

The Board views the incident as both a "proud moment" for the town and a reminder that minutes matter in emergencies and preparedness saves lives

### **Susan Baldwin – Town Clerk**

Susan Baldwin reported that during the tax collection period just finished on March 31<sup>st</sup>. Of the \$12 million dollars we were to collect for our town, we collected 97% .

Also, she gave the Board three RFPs to look at for the handicapped doors for next month.

### **Brick Church Tree Damage**

Mike Monroe (Highway Superintendent) discussed damage caused by the last wind storm a few weeks ago. One fallen tree from Town-owned land damaged fence and stones. Another large pine from a neighbor's property fell into the cemetery, badly damaging several stones and requiring a crane to remove. Additional leaning trees on the neighbor's property also threaten the cemetery. The Town Counsel indicated:

It's often not practical to force neighbors to pay for removing already-fallen trees. However, sending written notice about hazardous leaning trees is important to establish potential future liability.

The Comptroller noted there's about \$6,300 in a Brick Church Cemetery fund, which is not enough to cover the likely full cost of: crane work, tree removal and any meaningful headstone repair. The Board agreed the Town should contact its insurance carrier first to see what damage and cleanup costs are covered then decide how much to use from insurance proceeds, the cemetery funds or possibly general town funds. Agreed Action Plan was to file a claim / consult with the Town's insurer about tree damage and cleanup at the cemetery. Send formal written notice to adjacent private owners about their hazardous leaning trees. Continue to gather cost estimates for

removing the downed neighbor tree by crane, removing hazardous Town-side trees, limited fence/stone repair if feasible.

**Comptroller's Report**

**1.) 2026 Budget Transfers**

On a motion introduced by Councilman O'Connor, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #138**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve the 2026 budget transfers requested for and listed in the Comptroller's 04/02/2026 Report to the Town Board.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilman Keneally, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0.

**2.) 2026 Budget Amendments**

On a motion introduced by Councilman O'Connor, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #139**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve the 2026 budget amendments requested for and listed in the Comptroller's 04/02/2026 Report to the Town Board.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0.

**3.) Saratoga Plan**

On a motion introduced by Councilwoman Kolligian, the board adopted the following resolution:

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0.

**4.) Service Award Program-Informational**

Ms. Moran said the Wilton Emergency Squad posted the list of points earned by Squad volunteers for the Service Award Program, (SAP). The list was posted for 30 days, during which time the volunteers had an opportunity to review their points and service information. There are no changes. The list, along with the complete data package, will be sent to Penflex, the SAP third-party program administrator and actuary. Penflex will then compute the required contribution to the SAP and bill the Town for the 2026 contribution.

**5.) Personnel**

**1.)**

On a motion introduced by Councilman O’Conor, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #140**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** to approve the request for overnight travel for Susan Baldwin to attend the New York State Town Clerks Association Annual Conference in Albany, NY, April 19-22, 2026.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, duly put to vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0.

**2.)**

On a motion introduced by Councilman O’Conor, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #141**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** to approve the hiring of Edward Bowers for the vacant, part-time Court Security Officer Inspector position, effective April 14, 2026, with no benefits at a rate of \$42.36 per

hour, pending the successful completion of pre-employment screening.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilwoman Kolligian, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0.

**3.)**

On a motion introduced by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #142**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** to approve the hiring of Judy Shinn to the vacant Part-Time Senior Center Director position, with no benefits at a bi-weekly rate of \$791.69 pending successful passing of all pre-employment screening.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilman O’Conor, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0.

hour, pending the successful completion of pre-employment screening.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilwoman Kolligian, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 5-0.

**Adjournment**

On a motion introduced by Deputy Supervisor Rohan and seconded by Councilman O’Conor, all board members in favor, the meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.