

Town of Halfmoon Planning Board

April 24, 2006 Minutes

Those present at the April 24, 2006 Planning Board meeting were:

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

Alternate

Planning Board Members: Bob Beck
 Jerry Leonard

Senior Planner: Jeff Williams
Planner: Lindsay Zepko

Town Attorney: Lyn Murphy

Town Board Liaisons: Mindy Wormuth
 Walt Polak

CHA Representative: Mike Bianchino

Mr. Watts opened the April 24, 2006 Planning Board Meeting at 7:00 pm. Mr. Watts asked the Planning Board Members if they have reviewed the April 10, 2006 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the April 10, 2006 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried.

Public Hearing:

06.131 PH Betts Subdivision, Betts Lane – 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. Brian Holbritter, of Brian R. Holbritter, P.L.S., stated the following:* This project consists of annexing a small portion of land off of two adjacent landowners at the end of Betts Lane. 30 SF off of Lands of Wesley and Dana Betts and 370 SF off of lands of William C. Betts. They are looking to provide a straight through 50 FT access on Betts Lane to lands currently under contract with Mr. Chris Abele. Mr. Watts asked if anyone from the Public wished to speak. No one responded. Mr. Watts closed the Public Hearing at 7:02 pm. Mr. Nadeau asked if the Town's Highway Department had any issues with this conveyance. Mr. Polak stated

that the only issue that was brought up was that the easement is still in place for plows to turn around.

Mr. Berkowitz made a motion to approve Betts Major Subdivision application. Mr. Higgins seconded. Motion carried.

Old Business:

05.126 OB Ellsworth Landing, Mapleridge Avenue – Major Subdivision

Mr. Ivan Zdrahal, of Ivan Zdrahal Associates, PLLC, proposed the Ellsworth Landing major subdivision project. Mr. Zdrahal stated the following: The proposed residential subdivision would be on a 52.04-acre parcel. There would be 37 single-family lots. There were comments raised at the Public Hearing and comments made by the Town's Engineer. Access would be at two points, one at Timberwick Drive and the other from Ponderosa Drive. There would be one proposed Town road and one cul-de-sac. They have submitted responses to the comments from CHA and have sent revised plans. There were concerns by the residents on Fieldstone Drive and the applicant is proposing to increase the Land Preservation area on the hill near the rear of the residences on Fieldstone Drive and a pipe to move the water from their backyards to the storm water system for the proposed development. They have worked with the landowners near the access points and all their concerns have been addressed and the necessary agreements have been made. They have submitted a supplement to the traffic study regarding the traffic issues. Mr. Mark Nadolny, of Creighton-Manning, is present to address the Planning Board on any questions regarding the traffic study. They are before the Board for consideration on a preliminary approval along with SEQR determination. Mr. Watts stated there were a number of concerns presented at the last meeting and he would like Mr. Zdrahal to address each concern that was raised at the last meeting. *Mr. Nadolny stated the following:* There were three main issues that needed to be addressed: potential traffic coming through Timberwick to Woodin Road and the Northway, Ponderosa Drive as a cut through road and excessive speeds on Ponderosa Drive. He went out in the field and did a travel speed delay runs and physically drove the routes 5 times in each direction for each route for a total of 20 runs. Mr. Berkowitz asked what time of the day this was done. *Mr. Nadolny stated the following:* He did the runs during the P.M. peak hour where there is 30 percent more traffic in the eastbound direction between 4:00 and 6:00 in the P.M. and there is 60 percent more traffic in westbound direction so the runs were done at peak in both directions during the P.M. peak. Based on those runs he was able to determine that it is approximately 35 seconds faster in the westbound direction and 42 seconds faster in the eastbound direction to use the northern route. That is primarily due to the speed and the shorter route path so it is assume that people who live in this development would start to understand that using the southern route would actually take longer for them to access the Northway. Mr. Berkowitz asked if they looked at future growth in the area of Grooms Road. Mr. Nadolny stated that in their analysis they used a 2 percent per year background growth, which is a general growth rate. The study also looked at traffic from Farmview Residential Subdivision, Spinuzza Residential and the Princeton Heights PDD in the level of service analysis, which indicated that the access points were going to operate adequately with those other developments in the background for future growth. Mr. Berkowitz asked what the level of service was at the Timberwick intersection. *Mr. Nadolny stated the following:* The intersections are rated on a grading scale of A through F and it is graded by approach and this is based on the amount of delay that the approach will experience – for example: A delay of 0-10 seconds would be a level service A, 10-20 seconds is a level service B and so on and so forth. Currently the Timberwick intersection is operating at a D, which is a 26 second delay. This is in the P.M. peak hour and it will remain a level service D

with an increase of about 6 seconds of delay on this northbound approach to Timberwick. So it is still acceptable and there wouldn't be any sort of mitigation that would be needed in order to improve that. You would start to look at mitigation when the levels of service were to drop to an F in order to improve that approach with additional turn lanes, etc. Mr. Ouimet asked if they had an opportunity to look at the earlier morning hours. *Mr. Nadolny stated the following:* They also looked at the A.M. peak hour and it is also in the traffic impact study, which is a better case than in the P.M., and the level of service degradation is less than what it is in the P.M. Mr. Ouimet asked what hours the study was performed in the A.M. Mr. Nadolny stated 7:00 to 9:00 A.M. Mr. Ouimet asked if the number of school buses and school bus stops that are in the Timberwick Subdivision were accounted for. *Mr. Nadolny stated the following:* School buses are counted when at intersections when vehicles that are counted by category. They count for passenger vehicles, school buses and heavy vehicles. More delay is associated with the heavier vehicle like a school bus and that is incorporated into the analysis. Whenever you put in the heavy vehicle it does increase the delay that is experienced. With 37 single-family homes that are proposed in this project, in the A.M. it will generate 35 additional vehicles in and out of the site and 44 vehicles in the P.M. in and out of the site during peak hour. Based on the statistical national averages, typically homes would generate approximately one car every peak hour and of course they are going to generate cars on either end of that peak hour. During the critical time, it is going to generate approximately one car every peak hour. This development will add approximately 37 vehicles in the A.M. and 44 in the P.M. but there are two access points east and west and two points of access north and south. The distribution of traffic is going to water down the impact that this development will have on the entire transportation network. Mr. Berkowitz asked if the Ponderosa access was looked at. Mr. Nadolny stated yes, they did look at Ponderosa and the impact was less than 6 seconds. Mr. Watt stated one of the issues that was raised at the Public Hearing was that people were concerned that this development would be used as a cut through to get from Grooms Road to Woodin Road. *Mr. Nadolny stated the following:* The configuration of this road is not conducive to cut through and he does not see a lot of diversion traffic. One of the questions that was raised was about the existing cut through traffic on Ponderosa Drive from Grooms Road and Woodin Road and he does not see this as a prominent problem. Mr. Ruchlicki asked how long is Ponderosa Drive. Mr. Nadolny stated approximately 3,000 FT. *Mr. Nadolny stated the following:* There was a concern regarding excessive speeds on Ponderosa. The posted speed limit on Ponderosa Drive is 30mph and 85 percent of the people are traveling at or below this speed. Typically you will find that people in a residential development will travel at five to eight mph over the speed limit. A comment was made that one of the intersections could be made an all-way stop in order to prevent people from traveling over the speed limit. The State discourages this because all-way stops are not to be used as a speed control as the all-way stop can generate more issues than they help. If the Town is receiving complaints that people are not obeying the speed limit, they could try Police enforcement or distributing a Town newsletter stating that excessive speed can be dangerous in a residential neighborhood where children are playing. Mr. Watts stated that the day after the Public Hearing the Town did ask for an increased Police presence on Ponderosa Drive and the Sheriff's Department did respond to this request. Mr. Watts asked the Board if anyone else had any more traffic questions. Mr. Polak stated that even though they do not encourage the all-way stops, by petition they had all-way stops installed to help slow down the traffic in some subdivisions. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Zdrahal if he had verbal or written agreements with people in this subdivision. Mr. Zdrahal stated they were written agreements and he would provide those agreements to the Board. *Mr. Zdrahal stated the following:* There were concerns by the people who live on Fieldstone Drive about

wetlands, cutting of vegetation and drainage onto their property. In response to these concerns they have expanded the land preservation area, there would be a 30 FT no cut buffer zone in the rear of the parcels and a storm drainage pipe would be installed on these lots. They have submitted a formal signed agreement with a homeowner who had flooding in their basement to install footings so the water would flow to a basin. Another concern of a property owner, Mr. Chandler, was with the elevation of his property and they have related to Mr. Chandler that the road is not going to be as high as he had thought and they are proposing grading to help with the run off and trees to be planted near his front yard and Mr. Chandler was satisfied. Mr. Belmonte, the applicant, stated that Mr. Chandler has signed the agreement and it would be mailed shortly. Mr. Zdrahal stated they have a signed agreement with Mr. Daly regarding deeding a portion of land to his property so there would be an adequate setback from the Town's right-of-way to Mr. Daly's existing residence. They also have an agreement with Mrs. Gurney to plant trees on her property before the new road construction and also deed a strip of land to her property. Mr. Belmonte stated that Mrs. Gurney would sign the agreement when preliminary approval was granted for this project. Mr. Berkowitz asked if the no cut buffer in the rear would allow the property owners enough room to install a pool in their backyards. Mr. Zdrahal stated yes, there would be enough room. Mr. Nadeau questioned Mr. Zdrahal regarding the note on the plans that stated parcel "A" to be conveyed to the Town. Mr. Zdrahal stated this is a storm water management area. Mr. Nadeau asked what the light gray area depicted on the plans. Mr. Zdrahal stated it depicted the existing pavement and the land preservation area. Mr. Watts asked if there was an access to Breski Lane. Mr. Zdrahal stated there was a lot on Breski Lane but this lot would have frontage on the proposed Cresthaven Drive. Mr. Berkowitz asked if lot #30 had an access. Mr. Zdrahal stated lot #30 had access to Cresthaven Drive. Mrs. Murphy stated that the statutory requirement is that the lot has frontage and this lot does have frontage. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Bianchino if he was satisfied with the concerns regarding traffic and drainage. *Mr. Bianchino stated the following:* Based on the revised plans and the submissions that the applicant has made to address CHA's comments, we have minor items that are outstanding. Regarding drainage: even with the drainage improvements that were identified on the plans and in the memo, we asked that a note be added to any drainage coming off of new services, such as roofs or paved areas, be directed into the drainage on the street so if there are roof drains in the rear of the property then that drainage would go back into the street system. The other issue was a minor engineering issue about vertical curb. Everything else has been addressed to CHA's satisfaction. If the Board decides to do an action, they do need a SEQR determination. Mr. Nadeau asked if the County response had been received. Mr. Williams stated that this project did not require a referral to the County. Mr. Higgins asked if frontage could include wetlands and land preservation areas. Mrs. Murphy stated yes. Mr. Polak commended Mr. Zdrahal for addressing the concerns raised at the Public Hearing in a professional manner. Mr. Watts stated he agreed with Mr. Polak. Mr. Berkowitz made a motion for a negative declaration as to SEQR. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Berkowitz made a motion to grant preliminary approval contingent upon CHA's sign-off. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried.

05.133 OB Precision Valve & Automation, 15 Solar Drive – Commercial Site Plan

Mr. Chris Motyl, professional engineer, is representing Precision Valve & Automation for a commercial site plan located at 15 Solar Drive. *Mr. Motyl stated the following:* He is before the Planning Board to give comments on some of the Board's concerns from the April 10, 2006 Planning Board meeting. The Board's primary concerns were regarding parking and the number

of employees PVA's current operation has as well as the proposed operation. The proposed commercial site plan is to put an addition onto the back of the existing building. Currently PVA has a total of 51 employees. Of these 51 employees there are 12 field service or field sales employees. Essentially these 12 employees are not working out of the building on a full-time basis. Of the 51 employees they took away 12 and added back in 50 percent, so at any one time, there could be 50 percent of those people parking in the lot. So the total employees on-site at any one given time would be 45 employees present. The plan for the addition is to add 4 employees, which would bring the total to 49. Currently the parking lot has a total of 42 parking spaces with more parking available in the rear. To address the Board's comments at the last meeting, they did go back and add more parking and they are proposing 13 more parking spaces for a total 55 spaces. Of these 55 parking spaces, 49 spaces would be designated for existing and proposed employees, which would allow for 6 additional spaces for visitors. Mr. Berkowitz asked how often PVA had visitors. Mr. Hynes, the applicant, stated the following: There would be visitors every day. Sometimes there may be 1 person; sometimes there could 4 or 5 people. These visitors are customers who come to visit and spend a day or two at the facility. Mr. Berkowitz stated that there have been complaints about parking problems. Mr. Motyl stated there were concerns with people parking on the road and they did look into this. *Mr. Hynes stated the following:* One of the problems they have had regarding the lack of parking is because they were keeping inventory outside that took up part of the parking spaces. In the new plan they are proposing more parking spaces and this will alleviate any parking problems they have had even with storing the inventory in the rear of the site. This inventory probably takes up at least 6 parking spaces. Mr. Berkowitz asked where the employees would be parking. *Mr. Hynes stated the following:* They normally like to leave the spaces in the front of the door open and the handicap space open. A lot of the employees will park up front but quite a number of employees will park in the back of the building. Mr. Berkowitz asked if there were trees cut down on this site. Mr. Hynes stated yes. Mr. Berkowitz asked if any trees were cut in the past couple of weeks. Mr. Hynes stated no, no trees have been cut at this site for at least a year, maybe longer. Mr. Berkowitz asked if there was adequate screening for the residents who live nearby. *Mr. Hynes stated the following:* There is approximately 150 FT before the property borderline, which are all woods. In the fall and the winter you can see the neighboring houses, but in the summertime you cannot. Because the elevation of these homes is higher than PVA, these people can see the roof of the building. Mr. Watts asked if they would continue to store inventory outside. Mr. Hynes stated no. Mr. Watts asked how many new spaces would be added. *Mr. Motyl stated the following:* There would be the 6 spaces that were used for the inventory stored outside, with 5 additional parallel parking spaces on the side and more could be added if they needed them. They would be removing a striped area in the existing lot, which would add 2 parking spaces. Initially the plan showed a total of 8 parking spaces in front of the building and there are actually 9 parking spaces. They are proposing an additional 13 parking spaces. Mr. Watts asked the size of the parking spaces. Mr. Motyl stated some parking spaces are 10 FT x 20 FT and the spaces in the front of the building are 9.5 FT x 20 FT, which do meet all of the requirements. Mr. Watts stated that the Planning Board does allow and has been approving 9 FT x 18 FT for employee parking so they may be able to add more parking with these dimensions. Mr. Polak asked why cars were parking on the lawn and all over the street if they have so much parking. *Mr. Hynes stated the following:* Unless there was some extraordinary circumstance there is never anyone parking on the street. They have put some cars on the lawn but that was because they were not utilizing the proposed 5 parallel parking spaces. Now that they can utilize the proposed 5 parallel parking spaces then there would be no reason to park anywhere on the lawn. He does not

know where this information came from about cars parking up and down the street because that information is not accurate. Mr. Berkowitz asked how many more parking spaces they would gain if they made the spaces 9 FT x 18 FT. Mr. Motyl stated the following: They could probably gain 1 parking space in both rows in addition to 3 more spaces in the back and the proposed 5 parallel parking spaces could be extended. The entire access drive would be open, there would be signs for the fire lane and no parking and no standing signs continued around the entire addition. They are proposing new asphalt for the driveway and there would be no parking on the driveway. Mr. Berkowitz asked if they would be averse to re-striping. Mr. Motyl stated he did not see why they couldn't re-stripe. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Bianchino if he had received a storm water plan. *Mr. Bianchino stated the following:* They have received the storm water plan and the plan was acceptable. He did visit the site and look at the parking and did observe that people were parked on the lawn and the number of cars did exceed the striped spaces so they did have a comment on that issue which they are trying to address. These were the only two issues and everything else was addressed. Mr. Watts stated if the parking is reconfigured with 9 FT x 18 FT spaces for the employee parking there would be ample parking. Mr. Roberts asked if the proposed addition was just for storage or would they hire new employees to occupy some of that space and how would this relate to the parking issue. Mr. Motyl stated the new addition would be used for inventory and manufacturing with the possibility of hiring 4 new employees that were included in the parking plan. Mr. Berkowitz made a motion to approve the commercial site plan for Precision Valve & Automation contingent upon a site plan to be submitted showing the 9 FT x 18 FT parking spaces and no parking fire lane signs are to be placed around the building and no outside storage. Mr. Roberts seconded. Motion carried.

06.119 OB Savemore Beverage/Quiznos Subs, 1512 Route 9 – Addition to Site Plan

Mr. Tom Andress, of ABD Engineering, proposed an addition to site plan for Savemore Beverage for a Quiznos Sub shop located at 1512 Route 9. *Mr. Andress stated the following:* At the April 10, 2006 Planning Board meeting there were some concerns in reference to drainage at this site especially to the adjoining parcel to the north. They met at the site with the adjoining property owners, CHA, Mr. Bob Popp, owner of Savemore Beverage, and a representative for ABD Engineering. The meeting concluded that parking spaces would be added at the north corner of the property and the wing edge would be extended to help convert the water toward the rear of the property into the storm water basin. They would also continue to construction the proposed swale. Mr. Bob Lockwood, of CHA, stated in a letter that this would be the agreement. In addition, they reviewed the Board's comments in reference to the handicap spaces on the side that have moved to the front, and they have now added 4 land banked spaces on the backside of the proposed Quiznos Subs. Mr. Watts asked what the architecture of the building would be. Mr. Andress stated he did not have a plan with him. Mr. Bob Popp stated the north side of the building would match the existing building with brick and glass in the front. Mr. Berkowitz asked if they were planning a drive-thru. Mr. Popp stated no. Mr. Roberts asked if there would be a sign application in the future. Mr. Andress stated yes. Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the addition to site plan for Savemore Beverage/Quiznos Subs. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried.

New Business:**06.149 NB Casale Rent-All, 1614 Route 9 – Addition to Site Plan**

Mr. Tom Andress, of ABD Engineering, proposed an addition to the site plan for Casale Rent-All located at 1614 Route 9. *Mr. Andress stated the following:* Mr. Casale is proposing a secondary entrance to the site that is currently under construction. Mr. Casale has already added fill to this secondary entrance and they are before the Board for an approval for this addition to the site plan. During the construction of Casale Rent-All there was much concern regarding the use of the existing driveway, which was approved under the site plan, and there was concern by the people who live in the apartments to the south of the project. Mr. Casale has a deeded access that goes through the adjoining property and he had concern with the existing residents and wanted to use a different access for heavy equipment. At the present time the site is under construction and the detention basins are installed. Mr. Roberts asked if the Planning Board gave approval for one access, why did the applicant take it upon himself to build a new access without approval for the Board. *Mr. Andress stated the following:* He didn't know why Mr. Casale did not come to the Board for the secondary access as they did prepare a plan for him. He believes the reason Mr. Casale pursued the secondary access was because the residents were concerned with Mr. Casale using the driveway to bring heavy equipment into the site. Mr. Berkowitz stated that he met with Mr. Andress and Mr. Casale regarding the original site plan and it was stated that Mr. Hoffman, who owns the apartments, had no concerns. *Mr. Andress stated the following:* At that time Mr. Hoffman did not have concerns and he does not know if Mr. Hoffman asked his tenants if they had any concerns. Mr. Hoffman has still been working with Mr. Casale regarding the tenants that have specifically expressed their concerns. Mr. Berkowitz asked if the area of the proposed driveway was wetlands. Mr. Andress stated the proposed driveway is on the edge of the detention basin from Maybey's. Mr. Berkowitz asked if Mr. Casale initially wanted an access off of Route 9. Mr. Andress stated that in the original site plan they showed a deeded access but Mr. Casale was not sure if he really wanted it or not. Mr. Berkowitz stated that Mr. Casale has started putting in the secondary access without the Planning Board's approval. *Mr. Watts stated the following:* Mr. Andress had stated there were some issues with the Town. Was there an issue that a "stop work order" had to be issued? Mr. Andress stated yes. Was there an issue that work proceeded after the "stop work order" was issued. Mr. Andress stated yes, that was his understanding. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Andress if ENCON has visited the site with you or anyone from your firm. Mr. Andress stated no. Mr. Watts asked if administrative tickets had been issued by ENCON and if so, what were the tickets for. Mr. Andress stated yes; one ticket was issued for not having the notice of intent on site and one ticket was for a violation for not obtaining an Article 15 permit for a Class "C" stream. Mr. Watts asked what the status was for these tickets. Mr. Andress stated that Mr. Casale is going through the process with ENCON and he is not sure what the resolution is. Mr. Watts stated he was advised that Mr. Andress was working on these issues for Mr. Casale with ENCON. Mr. Andress stated he was working on the Class "C" violation and he does not know what the standpoint was on the other violation. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Andress what he was doing with the Class "C" violation. Mr. Andress stated that they are trying to determine how it was classified as a Class "C" because the disturbance was across grass and they are trying to determine how the DEC determined that it was a Class "C" stream. Mr. Nadeau stated that at the time the original site plan proposal was approved, the Board did not feel the Route 9 access was safe and the approval was for an access to a private drive. Mr. Higgins asked how tractor-trailers would make it around the sharp curve if that would be the access and does Mr. Casale plan on paving over the top of the Saratoga County Sewer District easement. Mr. Andress stated yes, Mr. Casale does plan on paving over this easement and this was on the site plan.

Mr. Ruchlicki asked the width of the road. Mr. Address stated it is proposed to be 22 FT wide with 2 FT winged edges on each side. Mr. Higgins asked if a traffic study had been done. Mr. Address stated no. Mr. Berkowitz asked if sight distance measurements had been done. Mr. Address stated no, there was no report done for sight distance as this plan was sent to the DOT and the sight distances were adequate from DOT's standpoint. Mr. Berkowitz asked how the land with the steep incline would be rectified. Mr. Address stated he did not know what the incline currently is but they have a slope design for this. Mr. Roberts asked if the only change to the original site plan was a new access to Route 9. Mr. Address stated yes. Mr. Roberts stated the Board should stick to the original site plan approval. Mr. Nadeau stated he agrees with Mr. Roberts as the Board had issues with this entrance in the original site plan and they still have issues with it. Mr. Berkowitz stated he also agrees with Mr. Roberts. Mr. Higgins stated based on the fact that there is no traffic study, there is not proper engineering on this change they are proposing and the fact that tractor-trailers have to enter the site and how these tractor-trailer could maneuver around a 22 FT wide road and two 90-degree curves. Mrs. Murphy stated for clarification the Board's concerns arise from traffic, wetlands, turn radiuses, together with environmental and public safety concerns. *Mr. Watts stated the following:* The Board has received a petition from the Birch Briar Apartment residents that have asked that their letter be considered when the Board reviews the project to allow completion of the partially built access road which connects Route 9 to the newly built Casale's Rent-All. The petition talks about the noise, construction activity and how suddenly their small driveway became a new route for frequent cars and construction vehicles. The residents of these apartments have a concern with the utilization of the private road and would prefer Route 9 as the proposed access. Mr. Polak stated he wanted to remind the Board that this is the second time where the applicant has come in and stated he didn't need the access and then went without the Board's approval to build the secondary access from Route 9. Mrs. Murphy stated she would feel more comfortable if the Board determined it would be appropriate to refer this project to CHA for review with the understanding of all the concerns that have been voiced to the Board so there is an adequate record upon which for the Board to proceed. Mr. Watts asked if there was escrow for this project. Mr. Williams stated he would establish an escrow amount after the proposed project is referred to CHA. Mr. Watts asked if there was escrow for the approved Casale Rent-All project. Mr. Williams stated he would check to see if escrow was being received for the prior project. Mr. Watts stated it was the applicant's responsibility to provide, in writing, the information regarding the ENCON violations to this Board. Mr. Address stated he would provide the Board with copies of the ENCON information. This item was tabled and referred to CHA for review regarding concerns with traffic, turn radius, wetlands and environment issues.

06.150 NB Mohawk Army-Navy, 215 Guideboard Road – Change of Tenant

Mr. Arno Reihls and Mr. Brett Reihls, the applicants, proposed a change of tenant application for Mohawk Army-Navy Store located at 215 Guideboard Road. Mr. Arno Reihls stated the following: They have 3 other store located in Albany, Niskayuna and Saratoga Springs. The retails sales are for mostly men's work wears, clothing, boots, camping supplies and military related pins and patches.

Mr. Watts, Planning Board Chairman, was excused from the Planning Board meeting to receive a personal telephone call. Mr. Roberts, Planning Board Vice Chairman sat in for Mr. Watts in his absence.

Mr. Roberts asked how many employees they would have. Mr. Arno Reihls stated 3 full-time employees and a couple part-time employees. Mr. Roberts stated that this plaza has a lot of traffic and parking concerns and asked how many customers they anticipated. Mr. Arno Reihls stated about 3 to 4 customers at one time. Mr. Higgins asked if their display area would be entirely inside the store. Mr. Arno Reihls stated yes, there would be no external display. Mr. Ruchlicki asked the hours of operation. Mr. Arno Reihls stated the store hours would be 9:00am to 6:00pm Monday through Wednesday, Thursday and Friday nights they would be opened until 8:00pm, Saturday's hours would be 9:00am to 5:00pm and Sunday would be 11:00am to 4:00pm. Mr. Berkowitz asked if they would sell guns and ammunition. Mr. Arno Reihls stated they would sell knives but no guns or ammunition.

Mr. Watts returned to the Planning Board Meeting.

Mr. Watts stated the following: This plaza has recently been purchased by Mr. Peter Vasilakos and this plaza has had a number of issues over the years with the parking lot and the general condition of the building. He had a discussion with Mr. Vasilakos concerning some code issues at the plaza and Mr. Vasilakos has assured him that these issues would all be corrected. Mr. Vasilakos has repaired some potholes in the parking lot and the previous owner, Mr. Boyajian, had re-striped the parking lot. Mr. Vasilakos stated that he would be redoing the architecture of the building. He would appreciate it if the applicants would advertise as Mohawk Army/Navy of Halfmoon, NY.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve Mohawk Army-Navy change of tenant application. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

06.151 NB Bedard Subdivision, 167 Harris Road – Minor Subdivision

Mr. J. Norman Bedard, the applicant, proposed a minor subdivision of his property located at 167 Harris Road. *Mr. Bedard stated the following:* He wishes to subdivide 1.17-acres off of his parcel to create a flag lot for a single-family dwelling.

Mr. Nadeau made a motion to set a Public Hearing for the May 8, 2006 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Roberts seconded. Motion carried.

06.152 NB 3-D Cycles, 1570 Route 9 – Change of Tenant & Sign

Mr. Brad Howard, the applicant, proposed change of tenant and sign application for 3-D Cycles. *Mr. Howard stated the following:* He is one of the partners of 3-D Cycles and they currently have a shop that has been in business for the past 4 years in Parkwood Plaza and they wish to relocate to 1570 Route 9. There would be 2 full-time employees and 1 part-time employee. Most of the time they commute by bicycles so there would not be much of an issue with parking. During the busy season there could be 5 to 7 customer vehicles. Hours of operation would be 10:00am to 6:00pm Monday through Wednesday, 10:00am to 7:00pm Thursday and Friday, 10:00am to 5:00pm on Saturday. During the summer they are also open on Sundays 12 noon to 4:00pm. There would be no outdoor displays. Mr. Higgins stated that he was near 3-D Cycles establishment in Parkwood Plaza and he saw some type of organized ride and questioned what this was about. Mr. Howard stated it was an organized ride put on by a group that had permission from the other owners of the parking lot and was not part of his establishment. Mr. Howard stated that on Wednesday nights they do some organized rides but these rides generally have only 10 to 15 people and they ride their bikes to the shop and parking would not be an issue. Mr. Roberts stated he had no problem with the sign as they were just replacing what Toys n' More had and asked if the sign would have any neon. Mr.

Howard stated there would be no neon on the sign but they do have a neon logo that they keep inside of the shop. Mr. Polak asked if they sold motorcycles. Mr. Howard stated they sell bicycles, no motorcycles or any electric or motorized vehicles. Mr. Watts reminded Mr. Howard to advertise as being located in Halfmoon. Mr. Howard stated okay.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve 3-D Cycles change of tenant and sign applications. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

06.153 NB Anaconda Sports, 5 Corporate Drive – Change of Tenant

Mr. Tom Andress, of ABD Engineering, proposed a change of tenant application for Anaconda Sports located at 5 Corporate Drive. *Mr. Andress stated the following:* Anaconda Sports would be the principle tenant for lot #5. When he came through with the site plan a while ago, he didn't announce Anaconda Sports because they were still working on the final agreements. Anaconda Sports would occupy 6,000 SF of office space and 8,250 SF of warehouse space. Anaconda Sports would be a distribution center and would not have retail operations at this site. Anaconda Sports sells to sport complexes, schools, and organizations and also do uniform work. There would be a sales staff that would be making calls to different institutions. They would have screen-printing and embroidery inside of the facility. Mr. Watts asked if there would be 25 employees. Mr. Andress stated he listed 25 employees but they think they will only have about 20 employees. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Williams if there would be adequate parking. Mr. Williams stated yes.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve Anaconda Sports change of tenant application. Mr. Ruchlicki seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Ruchlicki made a motion to adjourn the April 24, 2006 Planning Board Meeting at 8:31 pm. Mr. Higgins seconded. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Milly Pascuzzi
Planning Board Secretary