

Town of Halfmoon Planning Board

February 11, 2008 Minutes

Those present at the February 11, 2008 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board Members: Steve Watts – Chairman
Don Roberts – Vice Chairman
Rich Berkowitz
Marcel Nadeau
Tom Ruchlicki
John Higgins

Alternate

Planning Board Members: Gerry Leonard

Senior Planner: Jeff Williams

Town Attorney: Lyn Murphy

Town Board Liaisons: Paul Hotaling
Walt Polak

CHA Representative: Mike Bianchino

Mr. Watts opened the February 11, 2008 Planning Board Meeting at 7:00 pm. Mr. Watts asked the Planning Board Members if they had reviewed the January 28, 2008 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the January 28, 2008 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Higgins seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Leonard replaced Mr. Ouimet in his absence.

New Business:

08.011 NB Trick Shot Billiards & Sports Bar, 1602 Route 9 – Sign

Mr. Wayne Gendron, of Hanley Sign Co., stated the following: I am representing Trick Shot Billiards. They would like to upgrade their freestanding sign. Currently they have a 4 FT x 4 FT changeable copy double face sign that was purchased at Sam's Club and it is plugged into an outlet on the sign. They also have a 2 FT x 8 FT box on top of that. We are proposing to upgrade that sign to an 8 FT x 8 FT and would be increasing the square footage by 16 SF but we are incorporating a 4-line changeable copy message with the sign so it would all be one continuous sign. The sign is a multi-pylon that already exists. We are not increasing the overall height of the sign just the one sign within the framework of the existing sign. Mr. Higgins asked how the message was changed. Mr. Gendron stated the following: They have interchangeable individual letters. They purchased an individual board from Sam's Club and just incorporated it on the poles. We would be building an 8 FT x 8 FT cabinet incorporating the bottom 4 FT of the sign into a changeable copy board. It would be the same thing they

have now but it would be newer and all upgraded. Mr. Roberts asked if the sign had flashing lights. Mr. Gendron stated no. Mr. Roberts questioned the blank side of the sign. Mr. Gendron stated the following: The gentleman's son from Parkway Music is running the business and the father owns the entire lot with Parkway Music, The Center for Security and Trick Shot. The very top piece of plywood is for the Center for Security. There is a face on the opposite side facing the northbound traffic on Route 9. The Center for Security approached me on a price to upgrade their sign but he didn't like my price so needless to say I'm not upgrading his sign. Mr. Roberts asked if there was any neon on the sign. Mr. Gendron stated there is florescent tubing internally illuminated.

For the Record: Mr. Williams' topics stated the following: The second proposed sign is to utilize the existing 2 FT x 8 FT "Trick Shot" sign on the freestanding sign and place it over the second entrance to the billiard hall building. Both signs are in accordance with the Town zoning code.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve Trick Shot Billiards & Sports Bar sign application. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

08.012 NB Dunsbach Station, 1396 Vischer Ferry Road – Concept-Commercial Site Plan

Mr. Leonard recused himself from this item. Mr. John Stevens, of Infinigy Engineering, stated the following: This is the first time this project has been before this Board. We are proposing a 9,000 SF professional office building on Crescent Road. The property is approximately 2.5-acres and is directly across the street from Bast Hatfield and the Mohawk Terrace Apartments are adjacent to the property. The location of this proposed building would be between the apartments and an existing home. The predominant feature of this property, besides the existing home, is a wetland that bisects the entire property right down the middle. It looks to be kind of a drainage collection from the south side of Vischer Ferry Road coming down dumping into a spring hole that then starts the drainage flow that goes right down to the Mohawk River. We have delineated this area and filed a letter with the Army Corp. of Engineers but it was in the middle of the winter so they are going to hold off on their confirming our delineation until the spring. We had to split the development of the property because of that wetland. The parking is proposed for the uphill side and we are proposing a wooden path connecting to the building. The proposed building is pushed right against the setback line. The property is zoned Professional Office/Residential (PO/R). I believe this was rezoned last fall. The way the site is laid out right now conforms to all the Town's current zoning. The site is served by public water but there is no sewer. We have shown on one of the drawings a proposed septic system; a conventional subsurface system in the front with the idea that if eventually there is sewage, we will run a dry line to the street. Mr. Higgins asked the distance from the parking area to the wooden bridge. Mr. Stevens stated I wish it were closer but it is probably about 70 FT from the edge of the parking to the building. Mr. Higgins asked if it would be a covered walkway. Mr. Stevens stated the following: It is pretty much open and up in the air right now. The challenge is that we have the wetland line in here and we have to get 45 parking spaces on the building side. The way the grading plan works out is that this is about as close as we can get to the wetland. Mr. Ruchlicki asked what type of vegetation was in that area. Mr. Stevens stated cattails and the entire property is generally wooded with a lot of scrub brush in the drainage way. Mr. Ruchlicki asked if there is something else other than cattails in the wetland. Mr. Stevens stated the following: Yes. The stream is seasonal and we have found skunk cabbage down there, there are a lot of big maple trees on the hill and also

along the property line with Mohawk Terrace. Mr. Higgins stated the following: How do you propose to control people parking in bad weather and not wanting to walk across 70 FT of open walkway? All you have is a 25 FT access going down to the building and a couple of handicap parking spaces. You are going to have people trying to park all up and down that area and the fire department has expressed serious concerns about being able to get emergency equipment in there. Mr. Stevens stated yes, we received their note and to respond to this we would sprinkle the building. Mr. Higgins stated sprinkling the building is not the ultimate answer because you still have to get emergency vehicles in there if something happens. Mr. Stevens stated the following: Right. There is practically no way of getting a paved surface around that building. Mr. Higgins stated maybe you should go with a smaller building and asked if they had looked at this possibility. Mr. Stevens stated the following: We did look at going with a smaller building but the challenge here is the wetland line. Even if we shrink the building, you are going to shrink it by cutting off the end of it. If we shrink it another way, it still would not allow you to drive around it. Mr. Higgins stated the following: You could eliminate building on that side and go with a smaller building on the other side and have your parking and building on the other side. I know financially this probably doesn't make sense. Mr. Stevens stated the following: There are 2 answers to that question. The first one you got it right as we couldn't develop the property and the second is that we are looking to put our own office here and I would need about 7,000 SF for my own office. Mr. Higgins stated you are going with a big 2-story structure, did you look at the possibility of going with a smaller footprint with 3-stories? Mr. Stevens stated I didn't consider 3-stories. Mr. Berkowitz stated a 3-story structure would not fit in the character of that area. Mr. Stevens stated the following: Regarding the parking, there are certain rules, I can never prevent people from parking along that area other than practically speaking you are going to block the road there. I would tell my employees that they couldn't park there. I think we can work with this crosswalk here to meet any kind of standard for handicap accessibility. Practically speaking, do people want to walk through the rain? Not really but my office in Albany requires me to walk from a parking lot about 3 blocks away so I am fairly used to walking through the rain. Mr. Ruchlicki asked what they are proposing for stormwater management on this site. Mr. Stevens stated on one of the sheets in the plans the stormwater pond is on a corner on the grading plan. I will confess that we absolutely have maxed out the development of this property. We used pretty much every nook and cranny of it and that stormwater takes up this entire non-wetland affecting area. Mr. Nadeau asked why they are using a PO/R zone for a commercial complex because this is contradictory to our zoning. Mr. Stevens stated in the PO/R zone you are allowed to put a professional office in. Mr. Watts stated this does meet the intent, however, the key is to the character of the neighborhood and I would think a 3-story building exceeds our height maximum. Mr. Stevens stated I think the height is limited to 35 FT, which would be a 2-story building. Mr. Watts stated in speaking with our Code Enforcement people, if the building was sprinkled then the fire department's access concerns and the State Building Code I believe would be met. Mr. Polak stated the following: The whole purpose of the PO/R zone was not to add 3-story buildings. It was to add things coherent with the surrounding area. The PO/R zone was specifically for neighborhood type building not commercial type buildings. This item was tabled and referred to CHA for their review.

08.013 NB Delisle Subdivision, 11 Angle Lane – Minor Subdivision

Mr. Duane Rabideau, of Gilbert VanGuilder & Associates, stated the following: I am representing the Delisle's in their request to subdivide a 1.6-acre parcel into 2 residential lots. The parcel is located on the westerly side of Angle Lane and 500 FT north of Farm to Market

Road. This originally was lot #1 of a 2-parcel subdivision that we did about 3 years ago. Now there is public water on this street and also they just finished putting in a force main to the existing public sewer. Mr. Higgins stated I think there are restrictions on the original subdivision where there can only be 2 houses on that property. Mr. Rabideau stated the following: I am not aware of this. At that point in time that may have been the case because they did not have public sewer and now they have both utilities. Mr. Higgins stated when they bought the property from the original owner I believe there were restrictions on that where it can only have 2 houses on it. Mrs. Murphy stated deed restrictions are something not imposed by a Board. Mr. Higgins stated no, it was deed restrictions by the Corps that sold the property originally. Mrs. Murphy stated we can't enforce the deed restrictions as it is civil issue for neighbors to enforce but we should be aware of it if it exists. Mr. Rabideau stated we will look into this as we were not aware of that. Mr. Higgins asked where is the waterline on Angle Lane. Mr. Rabideau stated it is on the other side of the road. Mr. Higgins asked if there was already one sewer line going down the side that was just completed a couple of weeks ago. Mr. Rabideau stated that is the one they are going to tie into. Mr. Higgins asked if both houses were going to be tied into the one sewer line. Mr. Rabideau stated I believe all 3 will be because it is a force main grinder pump type set up. Mr. Bianchino asked if that line is supposed to be dedicated to the County. Mr. Rabideau stated the following: Yes, at some point in time. They do have permission to tie in. Mr. Higgins asked if all 3 houses would tie in to a common pump station and then it pumps into the sewer. Mr. Rabideau stated no, they each will have their own grinder pump and then push it in to the force main and then it goes into the existing sewer. Mr. Higgins asked if they would all have public water. Mr. Rabideau stated yes.

Mr. Nadeau made a motion to schedule a public hearing for the February 25, 2008 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Roberts seconded. Motion carried.

08.014 NB Classic Interiors, 1675 Route 9 (J&S Watkins Plaza) – Sign

Mr. Kevin McCauliffe, the applicant, stated the following: We are proposing to change one of our existing signs and change it with some different lettering. It would be the same exact type of sign and it would be internally illuminated and there would be no neon. Mr. Roberts stated just so the owner knows this new signage takes up all of the plaza's square footage for signage. Mr. McCauliffe stated yes, the owner does know this.

For the record Mr. Williams' topics stated the following: The applicant wishes to take down the existing 8 SF "Home" sign and replace it with a 15.7 SF "Hunter Douglas" sign.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve Classic Interiors sign application. Mr. Berkowitz seconded. Motion carried.

08.015 NB Sushi Thai at the Park, 1701 Route 9, Suite 100 (Shoppes of Halfmoon) – Sign

08.016 NB Star Barber Shop, 1701 Route 9, Suite 400 (Shoppes of Halfmoon) – Sign

08.017 NB Lavender Fields Florist, 1701 Route 9, Suite 500 (Shoppes of Halfmoon) – Sign

Mr. Bruce Tanski, the applicant, stated the following: All the signs will be the same; they will be 2 FT x 8 FT for a total of 16 SF. The signs are brown extruded aluminum. I have submitted copies of the signs with the Planning Department. Regardless of the size of the store, we are going to keep the signs all the same for uniformity. All the signs would be wall-mounted, one-

sided and internally lit. Mr. Roberts asked if any of the signs would have neon. Mr. Tanski stated there would be no neon. Mr. Polak asked if Sushi Thai's sign would say "Sushi Thai at the Park". Mr. Tanski stated the following: Yes, the proposal is for the sign to read "Sushi Thai at the Park". I am trying to get them to change it to "Sushi Thai at the Shoppes" and if they do change it, I will be back to the Board for that application. Mr. Watts stated it would be good if it said "Shoppes" because we don't want people getting confused driving on Route 9 and Route 146 thinking that an excellent restaurant like that is in the other town. If you could get them to do that we would appreciate it.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the sign application for Sushi Thai at the Park. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the sign application for Star Barber Shop. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the sign application for Lavender Fields Florist. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

Old Business:

**08.020 OB Brookfield Place PDD, Guideboard Road – Major Subdivision/PDD
(formerly Spinuzza Subdivision-project #05.200)**

Mr. Ivan Zdrahal, of Ivan Zdrahal Associates, stated the following: I am representing Landmark Development for a proposed residential Planned Development District (PDD). The application was submitted to the Town Board last April. After certain issues we were solving, as far as the public benefit, the Town Board referred this project to the Planning Board for review in December 2007. The proposed project involves approximately 73-acres of land. The project would have frontage on two Town roads, Guideboard Road and Harris Road. The project is proposed for a PDD geared toward an empty-nester market, which is why we are proposing smaller lots. We are proposing 81 residential lots. There would be 2 access points; one access would be on Guideboard Road and the second access would be on Harris Road. The other components of the project include common open space parcels, land preservation areas and stormwater management areas. We have submitted for review a traffic study and a drainage study. We completed all identification of the wetlands. We feel that this project as proposed can be constructed. This project is proposing to extend sanitary sewer further along Harris Road as a public benefit. The report submitted for the PDD included a detailed evaluation of a potential sanitary sewer service area. At the present time this part of Town does not have sanitary sewer along Guideboard Road, Middletown Road and Halfmoon Drive. We have shown the section of the sewer we are proposing to build as a public benefit. In the report we have included an analysis of the total potential construction should the Town create this sewer district. We are proposing a Homeowners Association (HOA) who would own the common open space parcels. Mr. Marini, of Landmark Development, is present tonight to show the type of homes they are proposing to build. Mr. Marini stated the following: I don't want to seem presumptuous by the "Brookfield Place PDD coming soon" on this display because my marketing guy didn't follow my instructions exactly. This is representative of the product that we are building in another subdivision in the Capital Region, which is primarily designed to be marketed towards empty-nesters. The homes are all primarily 1-story homes with some 2-story homes but they primarily contain the master bedroom on the first floor. The homes would range in size from 1,550 SF to about 2,200 SF. We use different materials on the outside such as stone

and stucco and shake siding. When the houses are put in this setting and are landscaped properly, they look very nice. These lots have been designed to accommodate homes that look like this that are all 1-story. These homes have been very popular for us over the last 2 years. Mr. Roberts asked the price range of the homes. Mr. Marini stated we have not figured that out yet, but I would imagine that they would start around \$300,000. Mr. Higgins stated the following: We have some similar set-ups in Town now and we are running into problems where the driveways are not long enough and the people are parking on the streets. Obviously that is problem when you are trying to control traffic, snow removal and things like that. You are proposing a 35 FT setback that really shortens the length of the driveway. Mr. Marini stated the following: It is a 35 FT setback and you end up with another 15 FT from the property line typically from the edge of the pavement. So, you are approximately 50 FT now from the garage wall to the roadway. So, potentially you could stack 4 cars in the driveway. Generally speaking there are households with 2 cars, husband and wife and occasionally they will have visitors. Our deed restrictions allow for parking for events during the day but no overnight parking in the roadways. Mr. Nadeau asked who polices that. Mr. Marini stated the HOA. Mr. Nadeau stated because it doesn't seem to work in the other projects. Mr. Marini stated the following: I really haven't had a problem in some of the ones that we have been doing. I did find recently that somebody parked in their backyard rather than parking in the road and I had that taken care of. In this particular community where we are building the setbacks are 25 FT and roadway widths are 28 FT from wing edge to wing edge. This provides enough parking to get 2 cars in the driveway and not have the car overhang the sidewalk there. My experience has been that it seems to work out okay. Mr. Higgins asked if they were proposing sidewalks for this development. Mr. Marini stated no. Mr. Watts asked if they are proposing Town roads. Mr. Zdrahal stated yes. Mr. Watts stated the roads would be built to Town standards and Town width so the Town parking restrictions would apply. Mr. Leonard asked why Locust Lane is on the plan but it doesn't look like an exit from the subdivision. Mr. Zdrahal stated before this PDD application this project was in front of the Planning Board for conceptual review and we were trying to utilize Locust Lane as a vehicular access but this neighborhood was very negative about introducing traffic there. We are proposing three Town roads with one that will connect Harris Road with Guideboard Road, which has better sight distance for an intersection. We are still planning to connect to the Town right-of-way attached to the Locust Lane right-of-way for a utility easement. Mr. Roberts asked why they are proposing a PDD rather than a conventional subdivision. Mr. Zdrahal stated this PDD project is aimed at the empty-nester houses and as such the properties are quite adequate for this type of product with the 15,000 SF minimum lot area. Many of the lots are much larger and still we would be preserving a lot of open space. In the rear of many of the houses there would be a no-cut area out of respect to the adjacent properties. Approximately 40% of the property would remain as protected land either as a common open space or as a land preservation area. Mr. Marini stated we are looking for a PDD because in working in the model homes and talking and listening with the buyers 3 out of every 4 buyers that come into our model home is looking to scale down. These people are looking to move into a product that fits their needs, meets their lifestyle and puts everything into a smaller package that they don't have to maintain. The people are very aware of the fact that they want everything to look upscale but they want it in a smaller package. Generally speaking you wouldn't design this type of product for a conventional lot that would be 100 FT wide by 200 FT deep like we are building over in Farmview where we do have a number of ranches there also. I would say that 85% of the people who are looking to do this type of product and build on these types of lots aren't interested in mowing a half acre, their not interested in fertilizing a half acre and they don't want to pay those bills any more. They just want everything in a

smaller simpler package and it is a trend that has been coming for a while and it is going to be here for a very long while because there are 77 million baby boomers across the country that are just entering retirement age. This is going to be the type of thing that buyers want and they are already out there looking for these things in mass. So, we are trying to find a spot in southern Saratoga County in the Town of Halfmoon where we can try and satisfy that demand. There are other successful subdivisions in the Town like Sheldon Hills and other places that are satisfying that demand and are doing very well. Mr. Berkowitz asked if they had given any thought to adding other amenities, decreasing the number of lots and stated that the open space in the back of those homes really isn't for anybody's use it's just to have open space where nobody can see it. Mr. Marini stated the following: It does serve a purpose in the sense that if the 2 lots don't connect, those people back up to those areas have no control over what happens and the control rests in the HOA. The no-cut buffer works as long as I am there and I am policing it. Once I leave and the HOA doesn't take an interest in making sure that this area remains undisturbed, and then the no-cut buffer disappears. Mr. Berkowitz asked isn't the idea to have a strong HOA to enforce the rules. Mr. Marini stated the following: The HOA is supposed to enforce the rules but this subdivision is 81 lots. With a subdivision this size, there really is not enough critical mass in the number of units that could pay for and support amenities like tennis courts, basketball courts and things like that. You would need approximately 200 lots to support any type of amenity of any substance and have it affordable for the HOA. Mr. Berkowitz asked why the drainage area on parcel "C" was tucked right into the Lands of Walker near 3 homes. Mr. Zdrahal stated there would be a lot of vegetation in that area. Mr. Berkowitz stated if I lived there I wouldn't want a drainage area right by my house. Mr. Zdrahal stated the following: The drainage area is not right next to the house and it is at least 50 FT away. Mr. Berkowitz stated the following: I wouldn't want it 50 FT away from my house. Is there any way you could tuck it internally? Mr. Zdrahal stated the stormwater basins go in by the topography with the way the land slopes. Mr. Ruchlicki asked where would all the drainage go from the homes located in the portion between the 2 cul-de-sacs because the backyards are against that wetland area. Mr. Zdrahal stated the drainage pattern goes to the wetland area. Mr. Higgins asked if this would be a full service HOA as far as maintenance, lawn mowing, snow removal and things like that. Mr. Marini stated the following: The plan is to set it up for an al-a-carte situation so a homeowner could chose to have lawn mowing included or not and they could chose to have snow removal included. There will be one fee that will take care of all the common areas of the subdivision which would be the stormwater management basins and make sure they get cut, maintain the entrance areas and maintain all areas of the roadways. All common areas that adjoin a roadway where there is no lot, for example: the grass would be cut along the edge of the road, there would be landscaping improvements with trees and there would be street lighting. The meter would go to the HOA and they would take care of those items as well. In other subdivisions that we are doing we have HOA's who chose to do them al-a-carte because we don't automatically have to put the burden of the lawn mowing and snow removal into the monthly fee to the homeowner. Mr. Higgins asked if there were any walking trails incorporated into your design. Mr. Zdrahal stated right now we don't have them but there is potential for a walking trail. Mr. Higgins stated that the residents would have to walk the entire road to get that trail unless you are going to put in a parking area down there. Mr. Watts stated the following: Relative to trails within subdivisions; the Town is developing a master plan relative to trails and every development doesn't have to have a trail. If we have a trail, it makes sense. We don't want trails to nowhere and then we have issues of who owns the trail and who maintains the trail. It may or may not work out. Mr. Higgins stated I wasn't condoning trails, but they are talking

about common open space and I was just wondering how the commons open space got utilized. Mr. Watts stated the reason why I brought this up is because sometimes the word "trail" will come up and then somebody will run off and think that the Town wants a trail and some of our trails have not been put to good use. Mr. Nadeau asked where they felt the traffic was going to flow to or from this development. Mr. Zdrahal stated as part of the document that we just submitted for review we have a complete traffic study. Mr. Nadeau stated I know what the traffic study is going to say but I'm talking realistically where would the traffic flow. Mr. Zdrahal stated I think the traffic would go to Guideboard Road to Route 9 and Exit 8A. Mr. Nadeau asked if you did a conventional subdivision did you say that there would be 15 less homes? Mr. Zdrahal stated right. Mr. Nadeau stated so realistically there would be 30 less cars that would go down Guideboard Road. Mr. Zdrahal stated when I submitted the application to the Town Board I worked with the Town Board on the public sewer benefit. We also looked at a traffic light issue to be located on Harris Road and Guideboard Road and potentially include the traffic light as a public benefit instead of the sewer. The Town has submitted the traffic study to the County because the traffic study basically acknowledges that a traffic signal is warranted at that intersection. The response from Joe Richie from Saratoga County DPW was that the study indicated the traffic signal is warranted at that intersection and it is their intention to submit it in the budget next year for the installation in 2009. After that response we went back to the Board because as a public benefit we are proposing the sanitary sewer, which is approximately a \$200,000 cost to extend the sewer. Mr. Nadeau stated in my opinion I feel there is a lot of density in that project with a lot of houses in there. Mr. Roberts stated I agree with Mr. Nadeau and asked what the Town Board has said about the project. Mr. Polak stated the Town Board wanted to get the Planning Board comments and then they would review them. Mr. Ruchlicki stated the following: One of my concerns based on the density is all the lots with the backyards that are up against the wetlands. Looking at the map, even though it appears to look like a drainage stream, the stream is not in the development it is outside toward the upper portion of the drawing. Are any of those drainage areas a year round stream? My real concern is the type of development that this would be with the well-manicured and well-maintained lawns. Now you have a multitude of homes verses fewer homes and maybe if there were fewer lots in that area the run off from those lots with fertilizers and things of that nature wouldn't be as intense. I think it creates an intense situation there and all the drainage would go into the Federal wetlands and my concern is where does it go from there? Mr. Zdrahal stated it basically is a wooded wetland and is a nice wooded area. Mr. Ruchlicki asked how do you have a forested wetland? Mr. Zdrahal stated because the wetland is all wooded. Mr. Ruchlicki stated so there has to be a stream somewhere near there. Mr. Zdrahal stated yes, there is a stream that flows to the large wetland area that then goes into another stream. Mr. Ruchlicki asked if the stream had a name and where does it run to and is it a classified stream. Mr. Marini stated the stream runs into the Hudson River. Mr. Zdrahal stated yes, it is a classified stream. Mr. Ruchlicki stated the following: My concern is relative to the run off from the housing lots being that close to the wetlands with no real buffer in there. I couldn't see if that drainage was going to run into any one of the detention basins, which I know would help to draw out any type of fertilizers that might be in that water that is running off. Mr. Zdrahal stated we will look at the drainage situation. Mr. Higgins stated I agree with Mr. Berkowitz about parcel "C" retention basin because you are right on top of where those people's homes are and I know you are saying it is 50 FT away but I don't feel that 50 FT is sufficient. Would it be possible for you to eliminate lots #13 and #14 and put it over on that side of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Zdrahal stated there is a

defined drainage channel, which goes through that area, but I will look into reconfiguring the basin.

This item was tabled and referred to CHA for their review and the Board requested the applicant to address the comments and concerns raised by the Planning Board.

Mr. Ruchlicki made a motion to adjourn the February 11, 2008 Planning Board Meeting at 7:53 pm. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
Milly Pascuzzi,
Planning Board Secretary