

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 2026-7:00 p.m.

683 Saratoga Road PUDD

Scott Lansing of Lansing Engineering, representing 683 Saratoga Road LLC, appeared before the Town Board to present the proposed Planned Unit Development District at 683 Saratoga Road. He explained that the town's PUDD process involves four major steps and that this project was at the third step. First, the applicant met with the Town Board and received a referral to the Planning Board. Second, the Planning Board reviewed the project conceptually and issued a positive recommendation back to the Town Board. The third step, which was the purpose of this meeting, is to hold a public hearing and to ask the Town Board to consider approving the local law establishing the PUDD. If the local law is approved, the project would proceed to the fourth step: detailed site plan review by the Planning Board, where full engineering design and all specific project details would be addressed.

Mr. Lansing said the parcel is located at 683 Saratoga Road and comprises approximately 30.99 acres, shown as the red-shaded area on the plans. Hilltop Drive lies to the south, Waller Drive is across the street, and SUNY Adirondack sits to the north. The property is currently zoned RB-1, Residential Business 1. There is an existing two-story 630-square-foot brick structure in the southeast corner of the site with a number of smaller ancillary buildings around it. A wetland survey identified New York State Department of Environmental Conservation wetlands in the central portion of the property, and an aerial image shows that the parcel is largely wooded.

The proposal is to focus development on the front five to six acres close to Saratoga Road and the pond, while preserving the balance of the roughly thirty-one acres to the rear as open space. The existing historic brick structure in the southeast corner would be retained and the smaller outbuildings around it would be demolished. The project includes a mix of uses. Along the roadway, two three-story mixed-use buildings are proposed. Each building would have a footprint of about 7,500 square feet, with approximately 6,500 square feet of commercial or retail space and about 1,500 square feet of amenity space on the first floor. The second and third floors would contain a total of 15 apartments per building, for 30 apartments overall in the two mixed-use buildings. Behind the mixed-use buildings, the applicant proposes seven three-story condominium buildings. Each condo building would contain ten units and have a footprint of approximately 5,100 square feet, with a mix of one- and two-bedroom units. Every unit would have an attached garage, yielding ten garages per building. Lansing said the condominiums are intended to be owner-occupied and to appeal to young professionals, retirees, empty nesters and seniors. He characterized them as a mid-price-point product in Wilton, noting that many new single-family homes in the town are selling in the \$650,000 to \$700,000 range, while these condos are envisioned in the \$400,000s, offering a lower entry price for ownership.

Mr. Lansing described the four-lot subdivision layout associated with the PUDD. One lot would contain the existing historic structure. A second lot would contain one of the mixed-use buildings. A third lot would

contain the other mixed-use building. The remainder of the property, including the condominium buildings and the undeveloped rear open space, would be on a larger fourth lot. Between the two front mixed-use buildings, a patio area is proposed so that appropriate first-floor uses—such as cafés or restaurants—can open onto an active shared space.

Mr. Lansing discussed anticipated first-floor uses. The concept is to support neighborhood-serving commercial activity. Examples including small grocery or neighborhood market uses limited in size so they function as local markets rather than large supermarkets; convenience and general stores; specialty food and beverage businesses such as bakeries, bake shops, coffee shops, ice cream parlors, and wine or liquor stores; personal services such as barber shops, beauty salons, spas and laundromats; local restaurants, cafés, and bar or tavern uses; and professional and creative offices such as real estate, legal, insurance, accounting, medical and dental practices, health-care providers, and veterinary clinics without boarding, as well as art studios, galleries, workshops, and spaces for craftspeople and artists. He explained that the goal is a mix of relatively small, walkable, neighborhood-scaled spaces. Pedestrian connectivity is a key element. Within the site, sidewalks will connect all residential units—both the apartments above the mixed-use buildings and the condominiums—to the commercial areas. Along Saratoga Road, the project proposes a sidewalk running the full length of the property's frontage, approximately 1,600 feet. That frontage sidewalk is to be extended north toward the Canopy and SUNY Adirondack area and south toward Hilltop Drive to create a continuous pedestrian route. Mr. Lansing also said they are proposing two crosswalks across Route 9, one near Waller Drive and another near the SUNY Adirondack entrance, so that people can cross safely and access both sides of the corridor.

In addition to sidewalks, a trail system is proposed at the rear of the developed area. A walking trail would begin near the pond behind the front development, extend back into the rear portion of the parcel through the preserved woods, loop around, and come back toward the developed area. Mr. Lansing emphasized that the bulk of the parcel to the rear would not be developed but would be permanently preserved as open space.

Mr. Lansing said the applicant is still refining building designs but has identified a style to emulate for the mixed-use buildings, featuring three-story structures oriented toward Saratoga Road with apartments above and commercial space at grade, and garages for the condominium buildings located away from the main frontage. He said the architectural intent is to create a higher-quality, village-style appearance that fits with the character the town is seeking along this corridor.

Mr. Lansing explained that all internal roads would be private, with no dedication to the town. Responsibility for ownership, operation and maintenance of these roads would fall on the condominium association and the owners of the commercial lots. He said that parking is provided at appropriate ratios for the proposed residential and commercial uses. The development will connect to Wilton Water and Sewer Authority and Saratoga County Sewer District systems. Stormwater will be handled entirely on site in accordance with New York State Department of Environmental Conservation standards, providing both water quality and water quantity controls so that post-development runoff will not exceed pre-development conditions.

Mr. Lansing reviewed how the project had evolved in response to feedback from the Town Board and Planning Board. Mixed-use buildings with ground-floor commercial and upper-floor apartments were

added at the front of the site at the Town Board's request. Sidewalks that were initially shorter were extended to increase pedestrian connectivity north and south along Saratoga Road. The sidewalk phasing plan was also adjusted so that sidewalks around the residential portion and to the north would be installed with phase one, while the frontage sidewalks directly in front of the future commercial buildings would be constructed when those buildings are built, with an interim route ensuring that pedestrians would still have a continuous walking path. He also described how, in response to board concerns about the perceived proximity of the mixed-use buildings to the road, the applicant had shifted them back from a 25-foot front setback to a 42-foot front setback, confirming that the site layout still functions with the deeper setback. Lansing concluded his formal presentation by inviting questions and comments from the board and the public and indicating that the applicant hoped the board would consider approval of the PUDD local law.

Steve Bederian said he observed that a number of similar commercial units farther down the corridor are vacant and argued that one of the major challenges for small businesses is the cost of interior fit-up. He asked whether there would be any kind of fund or program to help future tenants with build-out costs. Mr. Lansing responded that the two mixed-use buildings together would provide about 13,000 square feet of commercial space, which would be divided into smaller spaces to attract neighborhood-scale businesses. He said this is a relatively modest amount of new commercial footage in the context of the entire corridor and that the on-site residents in the condos and apartments would help support those businesses. On the question of fit-up, he explained that it is typically handled in negotiations between landlord and tenant. Landlords often assist by providing tenant improvement allowances or undertaking some of the build-out work themselves and then recovering those costs over the term of the lease. He did not propose a dedicated town-managed fund but characterized landlord participation in fit-up as standard practice in commercial leasing. Councilwoman Kolligian, who is also a commercial landlord, confirmed that in most cases tenants do not pay all of the build-out costs up front; instead, the landlord performs or funds much of the build-out, and any additional tenant costs are amortized over a lease of five to fifteen years. Councilwoman Kolligian asked about the current and future use of the existing historic brick building. Mr. Lansing said the building currently has a permit to operate as a bed-and-breakfast but is currently being used as a single-family rental, and the owner intends to continue using it either as a residence or as a bed-and-breakfast consistent with its existing permit.

John McEachron raised concerns about the type and size of commercial uses that might occupy the new buildings over time. He recalled that in the Hamlet zoning district, the town had adopted a specific square-footage cap on individual commercial spaces, intended to discourage projects from converting into large medical and dental office complexes and to maintain a small-scale, main-street character. In his experience, when owners struggle to lease space to small "mom-and-pop" businesses, they sometimes turn to medical and dental tenants who can pay higher rents, and that can change the character of the area. He worried that something similar could happen here unless the PUDD specifically addressed the size and types of allowed commercial uses.

Mr. Riper, Town Engineer, clarified that the square-footage restriction Mr. McEachron referenced applies to the Hamlet zone and does not automatically extend to this RB-1/PUD area. While residential density standards in the Hamlet have been brought into alignment with PUDD densities, the Hamlet's special provisions on commercial square footage were not written to govern RB-1 parcels such as this one. He

also pointed out that the PUDD local law itself is the mechanism through which the town can tailor permitted uses, setbacks, and dimensional standards to this specific project. Councilwoman Kolligian said they would like to encourage small, walkable, local-scale businesses here as well and questioned why medical and dental uses needed to be restricted, noting that there are already medical offices nearby and that such services are useful to residents. There was discussion regarding the desire to prioritize smaller, locally oriented “mom-and-pop” enterprises and the practical reality that medical and dental uses are often viable, needed tenants in a corridor like this.

Scott Kingsley of 105 Traver Road asked who would be responsible for snow removal and maintenance of the sidewalks. He wanted clarity on whether the commercial property owners along the frontage or the condominium association would handle those obligations. Mr. Lansing explained that, consistent with town practice, each property owner along Saratoga Road would be responsible for maintaining the sidewalk immediately in front of its property. The internal sidewalks within the development would be maintained by the condominium association and paid for through homeowners’ association dues.

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 March 5, 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'Connor 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'Connor 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'Connor 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'Connor 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'Connor said that was correct.

Councilman O'Connor 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'Connor 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'Connor 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'Connor 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'Connor 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'Connor, 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 140.-3-9 , 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 Councilman O’Conor, 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 held 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'Conor, 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-Zoning Board of Appeals

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 Rifenbary from the Zoning Board of Appeals, effective immediately.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilman O’Conor, 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 #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’Conor, 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 Abigail 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 Abigail 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 31st. 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.

Steve Bederian, Chair of the Alternative Transportation Committee presented a power point to show what bike/ped infrastructure could look like and to build interest for a town-wide survey on sidewalks/bike routes. Location focused on the area around Gavin Park and the Carr Road–Jones Road multi-use path.

Key elements of the demo project: Designate Beverly Street and Lewis Drive as bike routes (low-speed local streets) connecting the planned Carr–Jones multi-use trail to Gavin Park. Install bike-route signs at the entrances (“Bike Route” and “End Bike Route”). Sharrows (shared-lane bicycle symbols) inside Gavin Park, not out on Carr/Jones. Bike racks inside Gavin Park (up to 10 galvanized racks).

Estimated cost: About \$11,800 total (materials + labor). Plan to seek a Saratoga County trails grant (\$8,800), requiring a 25% town match. The town match would be in highway labor (in-kind), not extra cash.

Purpose: To demonstrate bike infrastructure (signs, sharrows, racks). To raise awareness and drive participation in a resident survey (what bike/pedestrian features residents want and where). To start forming a network that links homes, multi-use paths, Gavin Park, Hamlet and commercial areas over time. The primary concern from the board is safety of kids and residents getting to the bike routes. Jones Road / Carr Road currently have high traffic volumes and speeds. Difficult sight lines (e.g., at the bend near Gavin Park). Currently limited safe crossings . Board members worry that “inviting” bikers with signed routes could encourage more children to ride on roads that are not yet safely connected by paths/crosswalks.

Points raised were the multi-use path along Carr/Jones and flashing crosswalks are not yet built; those were designed to make these connections safer. Once the multi-use path and crossings exist, designated routes make more sense. Some Board members felt the timing is premature: Councilwoman Kolligian said we're inviting them into a corridor that isn't yet safe. Mr. Bederian responded that biking on these roads is already legal under NYS law. People already ride there today; this simply identifies routes and focuses attention. The sharrows would be inside the park, not on Carr/Jones Rds. Additional public comment questioned whether it's worth spending money to sign roads people can already bike on. Suggestions focused on a comprehensive plan that is funded and built once the multi-use path is in place, rather than a stand-alone demo.

The board had concerns about supporting the concept of low-stress bike connections and the demo idea vs. concern about safety and timing before the main multi-use path and crosswalks are in place.

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.