

Town of Halfmoon Planning Board

October 9, 2007 Minutes

Those present at the October 9, 2007 Planning Board meeting were:

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

Planner: Lindsay Zepko

Town Attorney: Lyn Murphy

Town Board Liaisons: Walt Polak

CHA Representative: Mike Bianchino

Mr. Watts opened the October 9, 2007 Planning Board Meeting at 7:00 pm. Mr. Watts asked the Planning Board Members if they have reviewed the September 24, 2007 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the September 24, 2007 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried. Mr. Berkowitz abstained due to his absence from the September 24, 2007 Planning Board Meeting.

Public Hearings:

06.185 PH Princeton Heights, Princeton Road – Major Subdivision

Mr. Watts opened the Public Hearing at 7:01 pm. Mr. Watts asked if anyone would like to have the public notice read. No one responded. Mr. Warren Longacker, of Lansing Engineering, stated the following: I am here tonight on behalf of the applicant, Belmonte Builders. We are before the Board for preliminary approval for this project. The parcel is approximately 39.5-acres. The parcel is currently vacant and is zoned Residential (R-1). The parcel is located on the western parameter of Princeton Avenue and immediately east of Interstate 87 (I-87). The plan shows an extension of Princeton Avenue as well as an extension to a paper street looping the interior of the site. The parcel is currently covered in dense woods and there is a ridgeline that bi-sects the property in the middle. When this project was first before the public for a public informational meeting in 2006. At that time the applicant proposed 274 residential units, which included a mix of town homes, condominiums and single-family units. The applicant has since revised the plans based on the comments that we received from the public at that public informational meeting. The new proposal is for a total of 47 single-family units. This plan is in conformance with the current zoning of the Town of Halfmoon. The minimum lot size would be 20,000 SF with a 50 FT front yard setback, 30 FT rear yard setback and 10 FT side yard

setback. The access to this site would be provided by Princeton Avenue and then through the connection of the development of the stub street to the northern side of Princeton Avenue. The proposed interior loop road would have a distance of 3,150 FT and would terminate into a cul-de-sac. For sanitary sewer the lots would be provided by an extension of the Saratoga County Sewer District. A new gravity collection system would collect waste and would discharge to a new pump station constructed on the northern side of the property for discharge to an existing gravity manhole at the intersection of the new stub street and Princeton Avenue. Water service for the site would be provided by a connection to the Town of Halfmoon Water District. The two connections proposed are both on Princeton Avenue. This waterline would loop around and terminate at the cul-de-sac. The proposed stormwater management would have two drainage areas with one area to the north and one area to the south and both stormwater management ponds were designed in accordance with the NYSDEC and the EPA guidelines. Again, there were a couple of changes that were made to the plan based upon the 2006 public informational meeting. One public comment was on the overall size of the development. The original proposal was for 174-units. We then reduced that to 155-units, then 122-units, and we are now proposing 47-units to be in conformance with the zoning. In doing that, we really decreased the amount of the impervious area. There was some concern about groundwater and stormwater runoff. We have decreased the road by approximately 1,250 FT. Another concern that the public raised was the existing buffer along I-87. The original proposal showed condominium and town homes units along the boundary and they were pushed closer to the road. We have since pushed the road up further to allow a minimum of 30 FT of green space in the back of the property building line. There would be approximately 200 FT x 210 FT of existing vegetation within the NYSDOT right-of-way. Again, other changes that were made to the plan were in the reduction of stormwater, the overall length of the road and also a limited connection to the parcel to the south. We do, however, have sufficient right-of-way should the extension of the road be made by the termination of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Watts asked if anyone from the public wished to speak. Mrs. Margaret Sautter, 30 Cambridge Ave., stated the following: The applicant has mentioned that they have reduced the number of units down to 47 single-family units but they forgot to mention that they went from 3 parcels to 1 parcel. To me I feel we can still do a lot better than this, as it still looks very dense to me. The traffic study has been revised but they did not do a new forecast. Mr. Ken Worsted, of Creighton-Manning Engineering (CME) stated we produced our original report in the fall of 2005, we updated it again in 2006 and when the lot counts change we updated it again in 2007. Mrs. Sautter stated you just updated the information but you didn't actually go out and do another traffic count. Mr. Worsted stated correct. Mrs. Sautter asked when another traffic count would be done. Mr. Worsted stated 2010 was our new build analysis in which we included other developments such as Ellsworth Landing and Hudson Ridge PDD. Mrs. Sautter stated the following: So there would only be a 10 percent increase and as I read the traffic study, that sounds very small to me especially since the Hudson Ridge PDD would create a huge increase. I believe that in your original study you did not look at Woodin Road, Grooms Road and Sitterly Road, did you look at this? Mr. Worsted stated when we did the updated traffic analysis we did analyze those intersections. Mrs. Sautter stated the following: What you don't have in the traffic study is where people would go to get to Exit 8. Cambridge Avenue and Dover Place both have blind spots and I feel these two streets would be used to get to I-87. Mr. Worsted stated the following: We looked at the NYSDOT traffic counts of the area and they have projected a 2% increase on the State Roads for a year and we used that in addition to adding in those other developments that we talked about. The traffic from those two developments was added on top of that 2% increase to represent the future. Mrs. Sautter stated the

following: This seems much more reasonable. Did you do an analysis of our neighborhood since we have 150 homes and another 50 would be added on and asked what kind of increase this would be? Mr. Worsted stated the following: This project would generate anywhere from 40 cars in the morning to 55 cars in the afternoon during those peak hours. The existing development itself generates 111 to 120 cars and the Princeton Heights Development has approximate 165 homes and typically generates 110 to 120 cars. That development on top of this is what we analyzed. We have both the traffic from the existing development and the proposed development on top each other. Mrs. Sautter asked what makes 53 cars for the 47 proposed homes and our development of 155 homes you are only giving 111 cars? Mr. Worsted stated the following: We are not using the same trip generation. The trip generation rates for this project are based on data compiled by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). They look at hundreds of studies of a residential type of development with single-family homes. They compile it and they come up with these rates. Those rates gave us the traffic volumes that we project for this project. If you look at the traffic volumes that we counted at the two main driveways coming in and out of this development, it winds up being a rate that is a lot lower than what ITE projects. If we were to take this existing neighborhood, take the rates of traffic that it generates today and apply it to this project, this project instead of generating between 40 and 55 trips would actually generate about 30 to 35 trips. If we apply the same rational as this existing development generates and apply the same thing to this which is an extension of that neighborhood, the numbers were actually less than what we have on the traffic study. Mrs. Sautter stated the following: I believe the Board and the community asked and told you that the one hour that you are giving us wasn't correct for our neighborhood and we all thought the numbers were kind of low for that time. Mr. Longacker talked about a paper road and I believe you told us it would be a cul-de-sac. Mr. Longacker stated the following: That is correct and this would be used by the Town as part of the Town Highway right-of-way. The road ends and terminates the cul-de-sac with the allowance of future right-of-ways. This would allow a future developer or anyone who wants to develop the Hoffman parcel to access the site. Mr. Gerry Magoolaghan, of Belmonte Builders, stated the paper street connection is not a requirement by us but a requirement by the Town and the Town does this every time a neighborhood is built. Mr. Peter Belmonte, of Belmonte Builders, stated Mr. Hoffman owns all that property and we had relinquished our contract with Mr. Hoffman and forfeited our deposit on the basis that we don't have any intention at this point to utilize the land but this could change in the future. Mrs. Sautter stated the following: I just wanted to make this clear that this was written and it was still an option. Do you have any information regarding the archeological study? Mr. Longacker stated the following: We have received comments back from the State Department Preservation Office as part of SEQOR and provided information to the New York State Office of Parks Recreation and Historic Preservation (NYSOPRHP) and requested them to take a look at the site to determine the significance. The NYSOPRHP did come back to us to request a Phase 1A and 1B archeological study be performed. Phase 1A is a research report where an archeologist can go and take a look in State museums and local libraries to determine what was on the site in the past. For example: Anything historic, any historic buildings, any historic neighborhoods or any Native American activities on the site. Phase 1B is an actual field investigation where they perform test pits and sift through material to see if there are any archeological findings. They did locate a potentially historic area to the north of the site in the vicinity of the northern stormwater management area; one by the NY State right-of-way and one near the northern boundary. NYSOPRHP provided us with comments last week based on the archeologists recommendation and report and to provide additional mapping. The major comment was if we want to do a Phase 2 study

in these two areas then we can do that or come up with an avoidance plan. We are coming up with an avoidance plan where we do not have to impact these areas. So what we've done is reconfigure the stormwater management area and provide the same volume and it still contains more water during the 100-year event than pre-conditions and it offers the 50 FT area around those potential significant areas. Mrs. Sautter asked if it would be 50 FT. Mr. Longacker stated the archeological project verified those locations to make sure that it isn't any further. Typically it is 50 FT and you should put a small fence to prevent somebody from going in the area. Mrs. Sautter stated the following: What they did was an examination of the site and did ten pre-contact sites within 1-mile of this project. The report said based on one previous project location, they had considered it to have a high sensitivity. However, they did avoid a lot of the areas because it was wet in May and will they go back when the area is not wet? Mr. Longacker stated no, they will not. Mrs. Sautter stated I believe the noise is going to be unbelievable because currently the area is wooded. Mr. Tom Baird, CME noise analyst, stated the following: The trees that are currently on the site are really not creating any kind of a noise barrier. The homes in the existing development would get a 2 to 3 decibel increase in noise levels due to the additional traffic on the road. At 2 decibels the human ear can just begin to tell the difference between 60 and 62 or 50 and 52. At 3 decibels some humans can hear the difference. At 1 decibel you can only hear in a laboratory with instruments. So it won't be a noticeable change over that 1-hour period that we measured traffic noise. Yes, there is going to be some increase trip noise from I-87 when the mounds and the hills come out along with some of the trees. But this would be offset by the rows of homes going in. So really it would be a null or a wash. Mrs. Sautter asked how much of a buffer would remain. Mr. Longacker stated the following: The aerial photos depict the contours. Some areas would be cleared but I think it would be advantageous to leave trees, as it would make the homes look more appealing. I can't imagine that every tree would be eliminated on each one of those lots. Mrs. Sautter stated I believe that most of the trees would be removed. Mr. Belmonte stated the following: I disagree with that assumption. As a building company we work quite diligently to try to maintain vegetation on lots. We pay dear prices for the parcels of land; we pay additional fees for ones that are treed. We are not a builder that goes through and devastates the entire site and remove all trees on the lot. There are going to be people, much like many of the people in your neighborhood, that are going to want a swimming pool and an area for a child to play and they are going to want additional clearing. Along with the fact that there are going to be people that are going to want to maintain as much as the vegetation as possible. I suspect anyone that would be backing up against the I-87 side is going to look to maintain as much vegetation as possible. There will be some variations from lot to lot but it is not our intention to go in this area and clear-cut. Mrs. Sautter stated the following: Previously the Board asked for something that showed the greenery and showed what was going to be kept. I don't know how the Board feels or how the community feels but to my eye it looks extremely dense. I would like to see this project still further reduced. In the mid 90's nine lots were proposed and it was approved and this sounds good to me. Mr. Belmonte stated the following: You are not the owner of the land so I expect that it would sound good to you. The density of this community is comparable to the density to what this Town's standards are and it also very comparable, if not less dense, than the neighborhood that we are adjoining. We are trying to take as much of the feedback as we can get from the neighborhood I'm hoping that the majority of people see that we successfully addressed it. It is impossible to solve every issue and build anything there. We always know that the desire is not to have anybody next door. We all like to be the last one on the street. Unfortunately in this circumstance we do want to build something on this parcel of land and we tried very much de-emphasizing the density. In

some ways it has worked against us because the larger buildings that we proposed earlier had much more substantial of a noise reduction impact as far as curtaining the noise from the existing neighborhood. We also understood that it was a compromise and the lesser density was the more desirable way to go and that is the way we pursued the neighborhood. I hope that through this you can see a lot of benefit to the changes that we did make. Mrs. Sautter stated the following: I know you said it conforms to the Town's standards and that might have been the old Town in the way things use to be done but I'm hoping that we are going greener in this community as it states in our comprehensive plan. I really hope the Board looks at this and realizes when the survey went out to the community the number one thing, after lack of taxes, in Halfmoon was green and open space. I hope that we look at that plan again and revisit it and if we need to, go back and take this into consideration. I think that is what everybody in the community wants. Yes, this looks great but I think it is old school and I think that we need to really think about the future and think about what we want and really think about the noise here with the increase volume of traffic going up through Malta. Mr. Bill LaBarge, 1 Princeton Avenue, stated the following: I am the first house on Princeton and when I first moved here I was one of two homes. There are about 11 children living on Princeton Avenue and this is a place where the children play and where I walk my dog everyday. I have a concern with the increase in traffic and how it would affect the lives of the people who currently live here. There would also be a lot of trucks and construction equipment going through this area. There is only one way in and one way out and that is on Princeton Avenue. I don't know what the solution is but I want you to understand that you would be changing the lives of the people who currently live here. Someone in our neighborhood installed a backyard pool and they cut down a lot of trees. Because of this construction my basement flooded and I did not have flood insurance and in the 25 years that I lived here I never had a wet basement. Just that change flooded my home and that was only a pool. I am very skeptical on what you are doing here and what it is going to mean for the quality of our homes and the way we live. I don't have all the things that you have in writing but I wanted you to know what it is like to be there now and what it use to be to live there. Right now it is a nice area for the kids and it is a safe area. Mr. John Dobis, 6 Princeton Avenue, stated the following: I thought the reason why this proposal failed last January was because they were taking 3-parcels of land and basically just dropping it into something. This new proposal is basically just the same thing re-spun. Princeton Avenue is less than an eighth of a mile long as the entrance into this massive drop of 47 more homes. I think you should consider this size only if there are two exits because there should be a second exit either to Grooms Road or to Crescent Road to the south. That would help in terms of the infrastructure and all of these families here wouldn't have to drive by Princeton, Newcastle and Manchester just to get to a main road. I think having 2 points of access into this large size development is clearly lacking in this vision and as we have mentioned, there are only 9 houses currently on our street so 47 homes is a pretty big number. I am resigned to the fact that something will happen here but I would really like to see 2 entranceways into the project. Mr. Ryan Serritella, 10 Princeton Avenue, stated the following: I live on the last lot on Princeton Avenue. When I bought the house I believe the Town of Halfmoon was under a sewer moratorium. Also, when I bought the house I was under the impression that I had the last most private lot on Princeton Avenue. Now we are going to have the least private lot on Princeton Avenue. I also have resigned to the fact that something is going to happen and Princeton Avenue is pretty much clear-cut of trees. The existing trees in this area provide a nice sanctuary for everyone on our street, as we are isolated in our own little community. I am concerned when you come in and you start taking down trees, what is going to be left around the existing homes on Princeton Avenue to serve as a buffer from the

development over the next 3 to 5 year and what is the grading plan. Mr. Longacker showed Mr. Serritella the plan where the vegetation would remain on the parcel. Mr. Serritella asked what the elevation was on Princeton Avenue. Mr. Longacker stated about 294 with about a 4 FT drop between two points. Mr. Serritella stated what would the impact be on our lives over the next 3 to 4 years. Mr. Longacker stated the following: Obviously every single home would not be constructed at the same time. I don't know which way the applicant would progress. There would have to be certain services done prior to the construction of the homes such as a stormwater pond, a pump station and some of the infrastructure. Mr. Serritella asked if they had a date when the construction would begin if this project were approved. Mr. Belmonte stated the following: It would depend on the market conditions along with the fact that we still have the State agencies to make it through and typically the cycle time through a State agency from the time the Town Board gives us permission to proceed is somewhere between 6 and 12 months. I don't see this nor plan on this being a Spring 2008 project. Could it be late 2008 or early 2009? Probably once we get beyond late 2008, then it is going to be a market condition situation. When the market starts to mend itself and starts percolating along as it has been, then the project may exist. If not, it would set dormant until a time that it does. Mr. Longacker stated then it is just a matter of how you would parcel out the phasing. Mr. Belmonte stated the following: We have not had phasing discussions, as it is not that large of a neighborhood so it is possible that it could be done in one phase. Again, it would be dependent on market conditions. Coming off of Princeton Avenue and getting to this stormwater management pond off to the lower left corner is going to be essential because we have to put the sanitary sewer in. So the probability that we are going to create that counter-clockwise pattern around the vicinity where your home is would be Phase I, which is relatively high. But the trees on the lot abutting your properties are going to be maintained. As I mentioned earlier, it is not our intension to be clear-cutting the site. We would never consider removing all the trees, which had been done on your street. We typically place deed restrictions on our homeowners that would prevent that from happening. If someone wants a lot that is clear-cut, then buy in a neighborhood that was a former cornfield and we do own some of those. Mr. Longacker stated the following: As the applicant has said he is required by the NYSDEC to do sections at a time unless he gets prior allowance from the NYSDEC to go ahead and clear more than 5 acres at a time. Generally, our limit is a total of a 5 acres disturbance at one time. Mr. Serritella asked the proposed total square footages of the houses. Mr. Belmonte stated I have not worked on that but we expect them to be in the 2,000 to 3,000 SF range. Mr. Serritella stated the following: I am not opposed to the development but I think the plan is aggressive for what is here. I think the size of this project is too large for just one exit on our street and if there were another exit it would help to alleviate some of the traffic issues. Ms. Cory Dandaraw, 9 Princeton Avenue, stated the following: I have several concerns regarding our existing roads that are not built for a lot of traffic, the noise level and the amount of cars that there would be. There are too many houses proposed for the parcel. I think it is commendable that the Board turned down the first proposal as I think it would have been devastation to our neighborhood. I still feel that this proposal would be devastation to my street. Had this been the project for 3 parcels with 2 or 3 different entrances, it would have been acceptable. I am pleading to the Board to treat this as your own neighborhood. Think about if you had a child or if you had a pet if you wanted 55 cars going in and out every day on a street that is probably not more than 12 FT wide. When I run on the street sometimes I have to dodge traffic because it is a very narrow road. Mr. Worsted stated the following: With 55 cars, if you had no other noise in the area, you would get more than 3 decibels. The problem comes in when you start adding the traffic noise from I-87. With the additional vehicles on your street and the I-87 noise that is

already there, the increase is only 3 decibels. If you take 60 decibels and add in 60 decibels you don't get 120 decibels you get 63 decibels. We have a high background noise level from I-87 and I think everybody can agree to that. When we add the additional vehicles it takes a lot more to get it to go a lot higher. Ms. Dandaraw stated the following: You have to understand the big picture. It is not just our development. There is already a lot of additional traffic since one year ago. As a community we have to figure what will happen in the future with the increase in traffic. Unfortunately this may be an environmental study made under perfect conditions and human behavior just isn't that. Again, I am asking the Board to reconsider this project. Mr. Joe VanAlphen, 31 Cambridge Avenue, stated the following: I moved onto Cambridge Avenue approximately 3 ½ to 4 years ago. When I bought my house it was at the edge of Oakwood Estates development and I learned that there was a no-clear zone as part of my property. I wasn't permitted to clear the area because it was a consideration for the neighbors on the other side so they could enjoy some privacy. I have come to appreciate that no-clear zone as being beneficial to all of us. Is there a no-clear zone in this area or is it just open to anybody doing what they want to do? Even though the developer may not be cutting trees down, is it possible that others might do that? Mr. Longacker stated the following: Again, the applicant had stated that in some of his developments he does have deed restriction on lots to prevent the future potential homeowners from clearing behind them and this is something that you can look at for this development as well. As you can see from the grading plan, we try to give at least 25 FT for a backyard for the homes so they can put in a pool or a shed. Mr. VanAlphen stated with that in mind, I would suggest to the Board that rather than leaving it to the developer, that the Board may want to consider requiring that there be a no-clear area around some of these properties so that the existing homeowners can enjoy a little bit of privacy that I have recognized as beneficial. I didn't see what the dimensions of the properties were but the size of the buildings that are shown here suggests that the buildings are somewhat close to each other. Do you have any idea how far apart the buildings would be from each other? Mr. Longacker stated the following: We don't. This is a typical footprint that we use when we show a plan. Again, the applicant had stated that he hasn't come up with the product yet or the actual footprint. The minimum lot side yard setbacks are 10 FT. It is possible to have a house constructed within that building setback line and to have 10 FT between these properties on each side so there would be a minimum of 20 FT. Mr. Belmonte stated the following: We have Town regulations where no building can come closer than 10 FT to the side property line. So each building is put at its minimum distance from the line and the buildings could be as close as 20 FT. Mr. VanAlphen asked if there is expectation that it could be that? Mr. Belmonte stated the following: There is always a possibility it could be especially when you are trying to get into a site where you are trying to accomplish something, such as working around a no-cut buffer or there is particular vegetation that you are trying to stay away from. There is a possibility that you may need to skew a house toward one side of the parcel or the other and bring it up against that sideline. Commonly that is not the case. Commonly you try keeping it centered in the lot to maximize the separation between two homes. However, there are sometimes obstacles that you have to deal with that you have to accommodate. So, you could bring it as close as 10 FT but no closer. Mr. VanAlphen asked if there was a minimum frontage for an individual parcels that you have identified. Mr. Belmonte stated the following: These home sites were developed with a minimum of 100 FT frontage. Mr. VanAlphen stated the topography of the area is very hilly and would you expect that when you are finished with this project that it is going to be much more flatter or level compared to what it is now and would there be a lot of earth movement. Mr. Belmonte stated the following: There are maximum slopes that you can have on roads and we all want our house to be level

so there is going to have to be some. But the intension is not to level the entire lot to go right to the rear property line and get that whole lot perfectly flat. Because if that is done then we are going to lose the vegetation and it is not our intension to lose the vegetation. Mr. Magoolaghan stated to expand on that, the general site itself definitely will not be flattened out. Because the topography like trees adds value and character to the neighborhood and we will keep as much vegetation as possible. We would still make the building site as flat as we can so the yard is flat. Mr. VanAlphen stated the following: I believe I read something about a requirement that a builder has to identify the trees of certain diameter and how many of those trees are going to be left behind or how many of them are going to be removed. Is there anything in writing relating to that subject of the trees and the diameters of especially the largest trees that are in there? Mr. Longacker stated I haven't seen anything relating to this subject in the Town code. Mr. Belmonte stated the following: I think there are municipalities that do look at that differently. When you go up into the Adirondacks, it is one of the EPA's positions. Mrs. Murphy stated the following: A lot of the deed restrictions and Mr. Belmonte stated he mentioned that he has one, the deed restrictions have in them where you can't remove any vegetation over a certain diameter so that may be what Mr. VanAlphen is referring to. Mr. Belmonte stated our general deed restrictions is 6 inches or larger unless it is diseased. Mr. VanAlphen asked if the deed restriction they were referring to applies to the buyer of the lot not to the builder? Mr. Belmonte stated that is correct. Mr. VanAlphen asked if there was any restriction that applies to the builder changing of the situation for example: If there was a tree 2 inches in diameter that was in the way, the builder could remove it? Mr. Belmonte stated if there was any tree within the course of that road and it is not feasible to move the road, then that tree would be removed. Mr. Magoolaghan stated for example: There was a tree that we planned to have removed in a neighboring town where it turned out that the tree was a rare tree and it was the biggest species that was known in town. Someone came to a meeting, such as we are having tonight, and told us about the rare tree so we changed our plan and moved the road to save the tree. We will do this on occasion when it is practical. Mr. VanAlphen stated with this in mind, has anybody identified any situations in this area where there might be some specific trees that deserve some special consideration? Mr. Longacker stated the NYSDEC surveyed the site to see if there were any endangered, threatened or any rare species of plants and trees and the NYSDEC came back with a negative response. Mr. VanAlphen stated the following: There was a comment earlier about decibel levels. It sounded like I was hearing that because I-87 is there and because the decibel level is as high as it is, is because of I-87 and this makes I-87 beneficial to this because the new decibels levels are not going to be increased that much. Mr. Worsted stated the following: You are correct. Well, if you have rock concert going on in your backyard, who cares if the neighbor has one too, right? This is kind of the way it works. Mr. Tom Flanagan, 3 Princeton Avenue, stated the following: I have been to many public hearings and this is very similar to the original submittal and at that point the Board rejected it because it only had one entrance. Has there been any change in the zoning since that point that allows a dead end road to be extended. Mr. Bianchino stated the following: This was not a zoning change but there was a change in the subdivision regulations. The design construction standards were modified in 2005 where any modifications to the subdivision would be at the Planning Boards discretion. Mrs. Zepko stated the following: This is what Mr. Longacker discussed earlier in regards to the 60 FT right-of-way at the end of the cul-de-sac. Part of the requirement of that change in the subdivision regulations was when the cul-de-sac was extended to that length. Mr. Flanagan stated originally it could only be 800 to 1200 FT and has there been any major changes in the zoning to extend that? Mrs. Murphy stated Mr. Bianchino and Mrs. Zepko just stated that there was a change to allow for the cul-

de-sac length. Mr. Longacker stated Mr. Bianchino stated that we are leaving the allowance for a potential additional connection there with the change in the subdivision regulations with a longer road of 1200 FT without that additional provision for a future extension. But when you have that future provision expansion, it would have to be more than 1200 FT. Mr. Flanagan stated the following: So I guess what you are saying is that you can allow 58 houses off of one entrance, which will all go through a subdivision that has substandard roads with blind spots. I believe the size of the road is 32 FT wide. Mr. Bianchino stated the current Town standard for subdivision roads is 28 FT travel lanes with 2 FT wing wedges for a total of 32 FT. Many of the old subdivisions were installed without the wing wedge curb. Also, the width of pavement was less than what is currently required. The standards are different now than they were previously. The pavement, the gravel thickness and the drainage have all been improved with the new standards. This development was put in before my time so I don't really know what the standard this was designed and constructed in accordance with. I do believe there are no curbs on the existing road and this is not unusual for those earlier subdivisions that were built in the Town or in any other Town for that matter. Mr. Flanagan asked if there were any studies done on the existing roads in this development. Mr. Worsted stated in general they are approximately 20 FT wide and I believe Princeton Avenue is 33 FT wide. Mr. Flanagan asked if the water comes from an 8-inch water main. Mr. Longacker stated yes, that is correct. Mr. Flanagan asked about the water main at the beginning of Princeton, which is not 8-inch. Mr. Longacker stated the following: We took data that we received from CHA with pressure and flow data and we take into account those types of flows. Mr. Flanagan asked if there was a potential entrance to Manchester? Mr. Longacker stated there is no plan for a potential entrance to Manchester. Mr. Flanagan stated my main concerns are the noise with the additional traffic and the narrow roads. Ms. Rebecca Weisner, 6 Newcastle Road, stated the following: We have a severe flooding issue every year. I am new to the area and have only lived here about a year. I am from Phoenix and I think this plan is something that should go into a larger city. The 10 FT between the property lines is extremely close and much closer than in our current development. I question why they have that one lot by my house. Mr. Longacker stated that was a proposed flaglot and the Town does allow for one flaglot. Ms. Weisner stated the following: These lots seem very close and to put one flaglot by our lot is strictly for money. One entranceway is not enough and they are absolutely right about the traffic. This needs to be taken into consideration for the potential roads that are not guaranteed in the future. Right now we don't have subdivisions like this and what you are presenting in that location would just be too much for the traffic and the noise. There are a couple of homes on Manchester that have been on the market for a very long time because they are so close to I-87 and that is going to be something that should be considered for this development as well because they are going to have a hard time selling homes to these people if the homes are backed up right to I-87. I think this area is wonderful, I think it is growing and I hope the development is great hopefully for our property values. But at this magnitude in that location it seems like an awful lot. My suggestion would be to come up with a new plan with fewer homes. Mr. Watts closed the Public Hearing at 8:12 pm. Mr. Nadeau asked Mrs. Murphy if the Board had the power to do a deed restriction for the no cut buffer in a subdivision. Mrs. Murphy stated the following: We can ask the developer as a consideration with regards to the deed restriction but the thing that I always point out to the Board is even if there is a deed restriction, this Board cannot enforce the deed restriction. It becomes a civil issue between the property owners. You could ask and the developer could agree but it is not your job to enforce. Mr. Belmonte stated the following: We have a number of lots that back up toward the adjoining community. In us voluntarily putting a deed restriction that creates a no-

cut buffer, we have done this in many other subdivisions, and we are not reluctant to do it here at all. The lots that it is going to be difficult to do this on are the 2 lots that are adjoined side-by-side with an adjoining home. I don't know what the situation is of the property clearing of 3 of the homes in particular against the property line but my guess is that based on the topography lines on this map whoever constructed this home took some great liberties and went at least 25 FT onto our property. In the process of doing that I am quite confident that they eliminated the vegetation on our property. So there is nothing that we can make up for what they have already done. But to promise the Board through a deed restriction that would be on the map that along these lots in this area that will impose another deed restriction to prevent tree clearing we are totally open to. It is our intension to maintain the trees. There is nothing I can do to enhance the area that has been cleared but I can prevent that beyond where that tree clearing was done that at least there is minimal buffer with no additional trees taken down before we get into the back yards of those houses. Mr. Berkowitz asked if the applicant could plant more trees as buffer. Mr. Belmonte stated the following: Anything is possible. It is very difficult to come in and try to decompensate for something that somebody did. To plant a dozen evergreen trees along that rear property line that would at least do some enhancement, if that makes a difference, we would be glad to do it but you can restore the big beautiful trees that have been taken down. Mr. Higgins stated the following: I have a question about the stub road. At one time we talked about the next site with a steep ravine or a stream that you would have to work around on that stub road? Mr. Longacker stated the following: Yes that is correct. There is a wetland on the other side so any further development on this parcel would require a permitting process by the Army Corp. of Engineers (ACOE). Mr. Higgins asked if they stated that there was no access out the other way available. Mr. Longacker stated at one time we had looked to connect in another area but there was a pond there. Mr. Higgins asked what if the pond was somewhere else. Mr. Longacker stated there is a low spot in the property in that area as well. Mr. Belmonte stated we were trying to negotiate with the individuals and one of the individuals refused and also there are some topography issues in that area. Mr. Ouimet stated the following: There are 2 issues that really bother me about this subdivision. The first is taking cars from 47 homes and putting them on substandard or narrow streets in an existing subdivision. I am not so sure that works very well. Traffic study notwithstanding, I know about numbers and its impact on major intersections but the bottom line is we are going to push these cars out on a 32 FT wide street that will be making a right or a left turn onto a 24 FT wide street. I think that is going to have a major impact. The other issue that I have is what has the developers engineers done, if anything, to address or at least think about the public safety impact of dumping all of these cars out one exit and one entrance. If there is anything that causes the need for emergency vehicles to come into this new subdivision, they are not going to come out if something else happens. It is too restrictive with just one entrance and one exit. I don't know if the engineers have looked at that and is there some study of some standard somewhere that says that you can take this number of homes and push it out through one street. Mr. Worsted stated I don't think there are any specific studies on putting more cars onto a narrow street. Mr. Ouimet stated it is not the number of cars. It is the one way in/the one way out and the impact of that on public safety vehicles moving in and out; police cars, ambulances and fire trucks. If something goes on in that area, there could be 47 separate incidents and more than one could occur at the same time. How would you move these 47 cars in and out? Mr. Worsted stated the same as you would on any other street that ends in a dead end. Mr. Ouimet stated most homes that have dead ends do not have 47 homes on it. Mr. Worsted asked when was the extension of Cambridge constructed on Dunsbach Road? Mr. Magoolaghan stated in 1991. Mr. Worsted asked if before

that the remainder of all of Princeton Heights was coming out to a single driveway onto Woodin Road. Ms. Dandaraw stated the following: Princeton Heights was not in existence in 1991. Princeton Heights was constructed in 1998. Mr. Flanagan stated the Northwood development had a boulevard entrance and had an emergency exit on Cambridge, which was unpaved, but there was an access in and out at that time. Mr. Watts stated I have closed the public hearing, therefore, the public can no longer be heard. Mr. Belmonte stated to Mr. Ouimet's question: We have Arlington Heights and Prospect Meadows and Prospect Meadows was designed with a 22 FT wide road curb to curb. This means that you are bound to that width. So having a road at 20 FT or 22 FT wide or anything more than that per today's standards is allowable in the Town. There have been bottlenecks out there and there have been situations out there where we had to get emergency vehicles in and out of the area. The Town has taken the position that they wanted to keep track of parking on one side of road, which kept the other side of the road as a comfortable thoroughfare to get emergency vehicles through. The other point Mr. Ouimet made was the one way in and the one way out. There is no question that we have the existing section of Princeton Heights that is one way in and one way out. Once you get into the development, other than the loop road going back to the cul-de-sac, you do have a circulation flow. So, if an instance had happened beyond the "T" intersection where the 2 new roads come together, you do have the ability to go in multiple directions. We wish Princeton Heights was wider or had a boulevard entrances for the remainder of the distance. We have worked with the Town Engineer recognizing that the standard does give the ability to the Board to extend the road knowing that there is a possibility that an extension will take place. We have tried working with Mr. Hoffman to do that extension at some point in time but it is not an opportune moment for him to proceed forward utilizing those other pieces of land. Our suspicion is sometime in the not too distance future Mr. Hoffman will reconsider that but at the moment he isn't willing to. Mr. Watts asked the zoning of Mr. Hoffman's land. Mr. Belmonte stated he has both; he has a residential section and a commercial section. Mr. Longacker stated the following: We have a good program for the emergency access. This program would allow us to take the fire districts ladder truck and we can modify our curb radius. In this program we can show what would be required for an emergency vehicle to come around these curbs coming in the entrances with a vehicle in the way. Mr. Ouimet stated the following: That is not my point, however, I appreciate what you have said. My point is on the existing section of Princeton Avenue further up and if that gets blocked off, you can't get access through that subdivision. Mr. Higgins stated the following: On the other two developments that Mr. Belmonte mentioned we did look at going with smaller roads, but we also put additional parking on the individual sites. There was suppose to be no parking on those roads at all per the original approval and when people drive through that area there are times when you can barely getting through on that 22 FT road. Mr. Belmonte stated the following: The Town had come through and they had placed parking restriction signs to one side of the pavement. When this happens, the other lane is a very good thoroughfare. As far as additional parking on the site, I think part of the concept there was that it was questionable if the length of the driveway reduced set backs. If the length of the driveway was sufficient for parking and if the desire was for parking out of the driveway to make sure there was enough space and that is why many of those driveways are pretty wide. Here we are sitting with a minimum 50 FT set back so you do have ample space to get 2 cars front to back let alone 2 cars side by side. Mr. Higgins stated I agree with Mr. Ouimet as far as the potential volume and if there is some kind of accident or restriction or anything where they have to do major roadwork on the existing roads. You are going to have 50 houses with no one able to get in and out. Mr. Belmonte stated the following: Those things can happen but we are dealing with a short section of road where it is restricted

to one access in and out. I am confident that a lot of thought was given in the Town when they came of with rules as far as you can have 1,200 to 1,800 FT or whatever the proper length is of roads that have one direction. Once you get beyond that point you do have multiple directions of flow. So, the bottleneck is for a short distance. Mr. Worsted asked to date, how many times has this been blocked off? Mr. Nadeau stated you only need one time. Mr. Nadeau suggested to the Board that the Board members visit the site.

This item was tabled for review of the public and Planning Board comments.

07.095 PH Russell/Meyer Subdivision, Lot #18 & Lot #20 Raylinsky Lane – Lot Line Adjustment

Mr. Watts opened the Public Hearing at 8:36 pm. Mr. Watts asked if anyone would like to have the public notice read. No one responded. Mr. Gil VanGuilder, of Gilbert VanGuilder & Associates, stated the following: This lot line adjustment involved 2 existing single-family homes of Mr. Ed Russell and Mr. Nicholas Meyers who are grandfather and grandson. They would like to adjust the lot line between there homes, which involved 4,419 SF. Both of the lots are in compliance with the zoning after the lot line adjustment. Lot #18 would be reduced from 36,078 SF to an area of 31,659 SF. Lot #20, which is the Russell parcel, would be increased from 34,929 SF to 39,348 SF. Both houses are currently connected to public water and they have existing septic systems in their back yards, which will not be affected by this lot line adjustment. Mr. Watts asked if anyone from the public wished to speak. No one responded. Mr. Watts closed the Public Hearing at 8:37 pm. Mr. Higgins asked Mr. VanGuilder if there were any wells on any adjacent properties. Mr. VanGuilder stated the following: We asked the Meyers' and they said that everybody in the area is connected to the public water that runs down Raylinsky Lane. We don't believe anyone is using a well for potable water but could be using it for irrigation.

Mr. Nadeau made a motion to approve the Russell/Meyer Subdivision, Lot #18 & Lot #20 Raylinsky Lane Lot Line Adjustment. Mr. Berkowitz seconded. Motion carried.

New Business:

07.094 NB Golba Subdivision, 13 Harris Road – Minor Subdivision

Mr. Fred Metzger, Jr., of Frederick J. Metzger N.Y.S.L.L.S., stated the following: I am here representing Mrs. Golba and her sister Connie Woskov. The proposal is for a small minor subdivision on an existing 6.91-acre parcel on the corner of Harris Road and Middletown Road. The applicants wish to create a 1.51-acre parcel with an existing residential dwelling located at the northeast corner of Harris Road and Middleton Road intersection. This action will create a 5.4-acre vacant parcel, which would front along Middletown Road. The parcel is zoned Residential (R-1) and there is existing public water and septic in the rear. All the zoning requirements would be met.

Mr. Ouimet made a motion to schedule a Public Hearing for the October 22, 2007 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Ruchlicki seconded. Motion carried.

07.101 NB Glen Meadows PDD, 130 Upper Newtown Road – Major Subdivision/PDD

Mr. Gavin Vuillaume, of Environmental Design Partnership, stated the following: I am here representing Mr. Chris Abele of Abele Builders. Mr. Abele is also present for tonight's meeting. We are happy to bring to you this proposed Planned Development District (PDD). The application is currently in front of the Town Board. We met with the Town Board twice and on both occasions we had a lot of good input from the Town Board with this application. At our

last meeting with the Town Board they asked for a few changes to the plan that we will go over. The proposal is for a 176-acre parcel of land that is currently zoned Agricultural/Residential (A-R). The parcel is located on the north side of Upper Newtown Road. There is an existing home with several barns on the property and farm fields to the rear of the property. On the drawing the light shaded green area are the fields. Towards the rear of the property there are some steep ravines that lead down toward McDonald Creek. The heavier dark green areas on the drawings are some of the more wooded areas. As part of this proposed PDD we would be leaving approximately 100-acres for common open space. This is a very common technique that you have seen on a lot of your PDD's here in the Town. This project would be very similar to the Sheldon Hills PDD in that we are looking at going to a mixed use of homes on the site that would give a variety of different homes and sizes of homes and arrangements that give it a little bit more of a different look than what you are use to seeing on your conventional subdivisions. Mr. Berkowitz asked how much of the green space was buildable. Mr. Vuillaume stated I would say probably three-quarters of it would be unbuildable and one-quarter would be buildable. Mr. Ruchlicki asked if the trees depicted on the drawing were the hedgerows that currently exist on the site. Mr. Vuillaume stated yes these would be existing hedgerows. Mr. Ruchlicki asked if there were existing trees on the interior of the two loops. Mr. Vuillaume stated there was a large grove of trees that are existing and we are going to keep those. There are also two more existing hedgerows and there is forested type vegetation. Mr. Abele pointed out other existing evergreens on the drawing. Mr. Vuillaume stated the following: We are proposing a single access off of Upper Newtown Road where we would have a boulevard entrance with a small rotary that would spin off of several roads going to what we call the patio homes or the smaller homes at the front end of the project. Leading toward the rear would be the location where we would have twin homes. The twin homes would be on several cul-de-sacs that run along the wooded areas or ravines that we would be preserving. The general arrangement that we worked through with the Town Board is that we made some adjustments. One of things that the Town Board asked for is to possibly make a connection to one of the adjacent properties. We looked at a piece of property as being one that is looking like there could be potential development. We will be meeting with someone who may be interested in doing something in this area soon. We would like to try to make some type of connection to that project as was discussed at the last public hearing. Mrs. Murphy asked who owned the farm. Mr. Abele stated it was the Gorsky Farm and I purchased the property in August of 1991. Mr. Vuillaume stated the following: We are looking at making a connection to the property next door keeping in mind that we want to be able to provide a secondary access wherever possible. We are somewhat limited on this site mainly because of the existing terrain at the rear of the project. The proposal is for 68 single-family homes and 80 twin homes. Obviously, if there is a different mix and the market looks like it could go a little different, we might have to adjust those numbers a little bit. Right now I think there is a pretty good market for these twin homes as we saw in the Sheldon Hills PDD that the twin homes sold rather quickly. We are anticipating having a heavy amount of the twin homes depending on the market and if things change we could go more toward the single-family homes that would be built on the smaller lots. There is an existing water main that was recently constructed along Upper Newtown Road where we would make a connection for the water. Regarding sewer, there are some additional lands that are controlled by Mr. Abele. The land may not be part of this PDD but could be developed in the future. There is a low area where we could place a pump station. This again, may be in conjunction with another project but we are looking at having a pump station somewhere in order to provide sewer to this project. The proposed pump station would take the sewage from this project to Betts Lane and

ultimately to Route 236 for the connection to the existing sewer line. We have areas shown on the plans for stormwater management. Again, this is very conceptual. We have also shown some landscaping up in the front with some berms along the rear of some lots. We are anticipating on doing some type of trail system throughout the project. The trail system would be used mainly by the residents of this community. There is the potential of maybe doing something along McDonald Creek to take advantage of the natural scenery in that area. We are looking for a recommendation from the Planning Board back to the Town Board. If there is anything we can do to improve the plan we are looking for suggestions from this Board. Mr. Berkowitz asked if there was sewer and water available. Mr. Vuillaume stated the following: Yes, but it is not directly on the site. Water is directly on Upper Newtown Road but we would have to propose a pump station in order to access the sewer, which is quite a ways away. It is probably a couple thousand feet down Betts Lane. Mr. Berkowitz asked if Mr. Abele owned all of that land. Mr. Abele stated we own the former Gorsky piece and we now own the former Betts piece. Mr. Berkowitz asked if the sewer would go through a piece of land that you don't own? Mr. Abele stated no. Mr. Vuillaume stated ultimately it would have to go to the Betts property but Mr. Abele owns everything in between. Mr. Higgins asked if there were 2 proposed flaglots. Mr. Vuillaume stated there was one flaglot that would be a twin home and then another one. Mr. Higgins asked if they did a conventional layout. Mr. Vuillaume stated the following: No we have not done a conventional layout. Mr. Abele stated the adjacent property, which is the Swatling Farm, we have had potential talks with the developer of that and the only change would be a pump station possibly could be located on the Swatling property. Mr. Vuillaume stated the following: Mr. Abele is very comfortable with the type of homes that we proposed for Sheldon Hills, which so far has been very successful. I think Mr. Abele's goal is to do something very similar to Sheldon Hills. Mr. Berkowitz asked if anything has been proposed for the Swatling Farm. Mr. Vuillaume stated I don't think anything has been proposed for the Swatling Farm. Mr. Nadeau asked what school tax district would the development be in. Mr. Abele stated the Gorsky Farm is in the Mechanicville School District and the Betts Farm is in the Shenendehowa School District. Mr. Nadeau asked if a traffic analysis had been done. Mr. Vuillaume stated the following: We did a trip generation for the 150 units that were prepared by Creighton-Manning Engineering (CME) back in April. CME came up with approximately 71 trips during the morning peak hour and 84 trips during the afternoon. We also did a sight distance analysis of Upper Newtown Road in which the report states that we do meet all the criteria based on the standards. The operating speed was done at 60 mph. Mr. Abele stated the following: Basically we do want to do a similar project as the Sheldon Hills PDD. Although this project is not in a GEIS area, we are still trying to incorporate a lot of the principals that we did in Sheldon Hills. We have tried to maintain a fair amount of green space. The lot sizes are slightly smaller but want to definitely increase our landscaping packages per home to create beauty and privacy all at once. We tried to keep the homes off of Upper Newtown Road with 300 to 400 FT to maintain the green belt that is there. We tried to incorporate the rotary because it seems to be something that the NYSDOT is going towards and it allows you to move traffic continuously but also gives you a lot of opportunity to create some real beauty. Mr. Watts asked if the rotary was internal to this project. Mr. Abele stated yes. Mr. Abele stated the following: There is a pocket park that we would like to maintain where there are existing trees and as Mr. Vuillaume has said, there would be trail system. It would be a Homeowners Association (HOA) maintained community. The only difference that I can see relative to Sheldon Hills is that the extent of the HOA would not be to the extent of the Sheldon Hills HOA. In other words, there will not be a clubhouse or a swimming pool and Glen Meadows would have fewer amenities. The maintenance free aspect of it will be the same as

well as a scaled down amount of amenities. We were very mindful of the GEIS directives and we did try to incorporate them in this project also. Mr. Watts read the Saratoga County Planning Board response letter dated September 7, 2007 **(see attachment below-pages 16 and 17)**



SARATOGA COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

TOM L. LEWIS
CHAIRMAN

JASON KEMPER
DIRECTOR

September 7, 2007

RECEIVED
SEP 13 2007
RECEIVED
SEP 12 2007

Mary Pearson, Town Clerk
Town of Halfmoon Town Hall
111 Route 236
Halfmoon, NY 12065

TOWN OF HALFMOON
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
TOWN OF HALFMOON
MARY J. PEARSON, TOWN CLERK

RE: SCPB Referral Review #07-153 – Abele Builders, Inc.
Zoning Amendment – PDD – Glen Meadows PDD (150SF & 2-Family units)
Upper Newtown Road (CR #86)

Received from the town of Halfmoon Town Board on August 10, 2007.

Reviewed by the Saratoga County Planning Board on August 16, 2007.

Decision: Approve

Comment: The site plan submitted for review proposes the construction of 68 single family detached units and 82 two-family units on a 176-acre parcel. Fifty percent of the site is comprised of slopes greater than 15% and ten percent of the site is of federal jurisdiction wetlands, resulting in 150 residences being constructed on 70 acres of developable upland area. While a PDD is the appropriate tool for creating a mixed-use community with recreational amenities and environmental protections, we suggest that the town board (and the town planning board in its advisory review) consider the impact of environmental constraints on suitable yard areas and slope stability in a building envelope. Usable yards, access and slope stability are of concern for the following units: 105/106, 107/108, 115/116, 117/118, 119/120, 121/122, 123/124, 125, 126, 131/132, 133/134, and 135/136. Agreement as to the developability of these noted lots may be a matter of the developer providing grading plot plans as part of the PDD Legislation. While the overall layout/design appears to be workable in relation to constrained lands it does, however, seem to be forcing the number of approvable units by the way that units 131/132 and 77/78 are being located.

The application narrative indicates that a traffic study of more detail than the preliminary analysis will be submitted. We appreciate a copy of that study being forwarded to our office to assist our future review of the site plan should the PDD be approved. The cumulative impact (of surrounding development along with this application) to the level of service at critical intersections should be reviewed by both the town board and the town planning board prior to any action being taken by the town board. The applicant should contact Ted Serbalik of Saratoga County DPW (885-2235) regarding a curb cut permit for access of the county road and for approval of any work undertaken within the county right of way.

2

It appears that the sole public benefit of the proposed rezoning is the provision of a multi-use trail system that traverses the steep slopes across what appears to be existing trails of some nature. The town board should be comfortable with the trail location and type of construction as continued maintenance and repair will be undertaken through the budgeted costs of a homeowners' association. The trail's enhancements and inducements for regular and continued use will trigger the amount of activity it receives. It is, therefore, important that the trail's maintenance as a public recreational amenity is accounted for within an HOA budget. We recommend that the town's trail committee investigate the potential for trail linkage to surrounding developable properties in an effort to make the proposed trail system available for public use as a public benefit of the rezoning application.

Ownership and maintenance responsibility of the proposed on-site pump station should be specified. Application for capacity needs to be made to Saratoga County Sewer District #1.



Michael Valentine, Sr. Planner
Authorized Agent for Saratoga County

Enc.

cc: Ted Serbalik, DPW
James DiPasquale, SCSD #1

Mr. Vuillaume stated yes, I think we are okay with everything there. Mr. Abele stated I didn't see the response letter. Mr. Nadeau asked what the square footage was of the single-family homes. Mr. Vuillaume stated the single-family home lots are about 10,000 SF each and the twin home lots would be 18,000 to 20,000 SF. Mr. Abele stated the following: The actual square footage of the twin homes would be approximately anywhere from 1,200 to 2,000 SF and the patio homes might be 1,400 to 2,000 SF. There would not be a huge difference between the livable square footage. The market is going to be primarily an empty nest market similar to what Sheldon Hills is. Mr. Berkowitz asked if most of the people living in Sheldon Hills employed. Mr. Abele stated the following: I would say that the profile buyer of a twin home is probably around 65 to 70 years old and most of these people are retired and a fair amount of these people are absent during the winter. With the single-family buyer, more of these people are still working and the age profile is about 10 years younger. Mr. Watts asked if there were any kids in Sheldon Hills. Mr. Abele stated the following: I have seen teenagers but I have never seen a little kid. Of course, grandparents will have their grandkids over. It is almost a predictable demographic in that even with the twin home buyer and the single-family buyer with that age differences. Mr. Higgins stated a school bus does go up into Sheldon Hills. Mr. Abele stated does it? Mr. Berkowitz asked if Sheldon Hills had any young couples without kids. Mr. Abele stated yes. Mr. Berkowitz asked if this would play into the traffic study when these people are coming and going. Mr. Abele stated it was a more irregular pattern but I sure you are eventually have some kids and there are people who still do work so the traffic times of 8:00am and 5:00pm are still in play. Mr. Higgins stated it appears that the trail system is accessible within the PDD itself. Mr. Vuillaume showed the Board on the drawing where the connection would be made. Mr. Watts stated the following: At this point we can refer this project to CHA as it is very conceptual at this time. We are going to have to hold a public hearing at some point when the project is more defined. Mr. Polak stated the only big comment from the Town Board was in regards to the trail system because of the new Town Park where they wanted to see a connection as this developed down to Betts Lane and with sight distance. Mr. Berkowitz asked Mr. Polak if there was any discussion about improving traffic anywhere else such as Guideboard Road and Route 236 in relation to this project with the impact and any alleviating measures. Mr. Polak stated certainly it is going to. Mr. Higgins stated the following: I think the County mentioned the density and also the PDD benefit to the Town. The trail system is nice but personally I would like to see something a little bit more than just a trail system as far as a benefit. Mr. Vuillaume stated we are working on the public benefit. Mr. Abele stated the following: We have had preliminary talks on the benefits and obviously the trail system is one and we are prepared to work with the Town for additional benefits. We are waiting for guidance from the Town. It could either be through similar GEIS fees or it could be for an additional off-site improvement traffic wise. We know we have to have the public benefit and we are willing to do that. Mr. Watts stated since it is a PDD we will put together some ideas ourselves but we have left the coordination of that up to the Town Board. Mr. Higgins stated the County also mentioned the density on some of these marginal spots. Mr. Vuillaume stated yes, we can clean that up.

This item was tabled and referred to CHA for their review.

07.102 NB Dudek Subdivision, 151 Brookwood Road – Major Subdivision

Mr. Greg Bold was before the Board to represent is representing Mrs. Barbara Dudek for a 1-lot subdivision. Mr. Bold stated the following: Mrs. Dudek wishes to subdivide her 7.92-acre parcel, which fronts on Button Road to create a 1-acre lot. This newly created lot would abut the property of Mr. & Mrs. Henry Riberdy. The new lot would be conveyed to Mr. & Mrs. Rick

Rosbozom for the construction of a single-family home. All the requirements for the Residential (R-1) zone would be met. The newly created parcel would have public water and a private septic system would be installed. This proposed action would leave the existing vacant parcel with an area of 6.92-acres. Mr. Polak asked if the Riberdy's and the Dudek's had shared property and if they had access to the pit. Mr. Bold stated the following: When the property was divided between Barbara Dudek and Stanley Dudek, the surveyor did some research and found an overlap in the two deed descriptions. As part of the drawing up of the deed for this new lot the attorneys will also modify the deed for the Riberdy's property and resume the fence line as the true property line. Mr. Higgins asked if there are any wells on any of the adjoining properties. Mr. Bold stated all the wells in the area are not currently in use as the water does extend further down Button Road so all the homes are already on public water.

Mr. Nadeau made a motion to schedule a Public Hearing for the October 22, 2007 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Ruchlicki seconded. Motion carried.

07.103 NB Mielewski Subdivision, 108 Woodin Road – Minor Subdivision

Mr. Lynn Sipperly, of L. Sipperly and Associates, stated the following: I am here to present a proposed 2-lot subdivision of property located at 108 Woodin Road. The parcel size is currently 1.20-acres. There is an existing home on the property that is owned by Mr. Frank Mielewski. The proposal is to subdivide the property into 2-lots with the newly created lot to be developed by Mr. Mielewski's son. Public water and public sewer is available to service the new lot. The existing lot would have 165 FT of frontage and the new lot would have 140 FT of frontage. The newly created lot would have a 20,067 SF lot, which would leave 32,278 SF with the existing single-family home. We would maintain a sewer easement on this proposed lot to let the sewer remain there. A new water service would be constructed off the water main on Woodin Road. The property is located in the Residential (R-1) zone.

Mr. Nadeau made a motion to schedule a Public Hearing for the October 22, 2007 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Ruchlicki made a motion to adjourn the October 9, 2007 Planning Board Meeting at 9:14 pm. Mr. Berkowitz seconded. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
Milly Pascuzzi,
Planning Board Secretary