

**MEETING MINUTES
Town of Halfmoon Planning Board
March 9, 2015**

Those present at the March 9, 2015 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board Members: John Ouimet – Chairman
Don Roberts – Vice Chairman
Rich Berkowitz
Marcel Nadeau – Absent
Tom Ruchlicki
John Higgins
Lois Smith-Law - Absent

Planning Board Alternates: Robert Partlow
Margaret Sautter

Director of Planning: Richard Harris
Planner: Paul Marlow

Town Attorney: Lyn Murphy
Deputy Town Attorney: Cathy Drobny

Town Board Liaison: John Wasielewski

Mr. Ouimet opened the March 9, 2015 Planning Board Meeting at 7:00 pm. Both Alternates will be voting tonight.

Mr. Ouimet asked the Planning Board Members if they had reviewed the February 23, 2015 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the February 23, 2015 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Berkowitz seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Hearing

15.027 Sheldon Hills PDD, Route 146- Minor Subdivision

Mr. Ouimet- Would anyone like the notice read? No one replied.

Mike MacNamara of Environmental Design- was present representing Sheldon Hills PDD. Mr. MacNamara commented at the last meeting: When Sheldon Hills Phase I was filed back in 2005 there was a 25,000 SF - parcel that was set aside for dedication to the state and to be added as right-of-way to Route 146, that 25,000 SF was shown in yellow on the plan. Fast forward to 2015 we're doing the design for the signalized intersection now and DOT does not want to take that entire yellow parcel, DOT wants only what is shown in orange which creates a gap between the town's right-of-way, Covington and Route 146. So what's shown in green is a rectangle that we'll dedicate to the town and then you have two leftover parcels on either side so total utilitarian subdivision.

Mr. Ouimet commented: Thank you Mike, would anyone from the public wish to speak? If not I'll close the public hearing. Does the Board have any questions? Can I have a motion on SEQRA?

Mr. Roberts made a motion to declare negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA and seconded by Mr. Berkowitz. Motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the subdivision application as presented and seconded by Mr. Berkowitz. Motion was carried unanimously.

15.030 Mechanicville Industrial Park Halfmoon Subdivision, Industrial Park Road- Minor Subdivision & Special Use Permit

Mr. Ouimet commented: Would anyone like the notice read? No one replied.

Mr. Jim White of Azimuth Surveying was present representing The City of Mechanicville – Mr. White commented: the City of Mechanicville has an industrial park which is 25.7 acres large and 19.2 acres of that is in the City of Mechanicville and 6.5 acres of that is in the Town of Halfmoon, which is zoned M-1 Industrial. The subdivision itself is to cut up several uses that are in the Industrial Park as it stands there is a Historic Exo-Tower which gets a lot, the city DPW garage gets a lot, there's a road dedication parcel and then there's three lots for future development, two of those lots don't really pertain to this meeting as they're entirely inside the city, but one lot which is lot D on the Southside Industrial Park Road is 12.5 acres, 7.4 acres of that is in the city and 5.1 acres of that is in the Town of Halfmoon. The reason that we're here is that we're subdividing the section of Halfmoon in the Town because also in the Town section there is a baseball area which had been used by Mechanicville - Stillwater Little League which is 1.4 acres and since the land in Halfmoon is zoned M-1 Industrial we are also here for a special use permit because the ball park is not a permitted use for that.

Mr. Ouimet commented: Do you plan on continuing the ball park?

Mr. White commented: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Ouimet commented: Okay, Would anyone from the public wish to speak? Yes sir, you'll have to come up and use the microphone over at the podium please.

Mr. John Fortune commented: We own the property across the street from the little league field we've owned it since 1967, we own a house that's there as well as a multi-unit apartment complex and we don't have any problem with the development of the property for industrial use however the only intimidation that we have is that down the road at the little league field maybe incorporated eventually into an industrial piece of property if the baseball field ever decides to leave or if they decide not to use it as a baseball field anymore or they decide to go up to the high school and eventually we have a fear that that property may be turned into industrial property with the growth in the area. And the baseball field as it stands right now is a wonderful segway into the residential area which is right across from the baseball field. I am thinking down the road that if they ever decide to not use the baseball fields and that eventually may be changed into industrial property it's really going to fringe on the neighborhood and as well as the property around it because that side is all commercial. So I was wondering if it's possible to have that piece of property where the baseball field is to remain, even if they do decide to leave in the future, as a recreational area, recreational use, so that it kind of adds a separation between the industrial properties where the railroad yards are and the residential section. That was my only concern as far as the changing and the zoning.

Mr. Ouimet commented: As of now they're going to continue the baseball operation there. Any change in use would have to come before this board for approval. If they move to change it from a baseball field to some other use it would have to be brought before this board. As of right now it's still going to remain the same and as far as changing the zoning that's not up to this board to change the zoning because right now it's zoned M-1 Industrial.

Mr. Fortune commented: That includes the baseball field?

Mr. Ouimet commented: It includes the baseball field; the whole parcel is zoned M-1 Industrial.

John Fortune commented: So this really doesn't make an effect one way or another, which way they decide to go.

Mr. Ouimet commented: No, right. Just carves it up into individual lots.

Mr. Fortune commented: Well as far as having it cut up and made into individual lots is really not my concern. I would like to see the growth happen in town, but our concern was just that particular piece of property. Thank you.

Mr. Ouimet commented: No I understand, thank you. Would anyone else from the public wish to speak? Yes sir come on up and speak into the microphone for the record.

Mr. Pete Enzien commented: I am the President, currently of the Mechanicville- Stillwater Little League and just to address your concerns at the present time, we have no plans of leaving for the moment, we've been there now for 63 years since 1952 and hopefully we'll be there for another 63 years. If that helps in any way, I know where you're trying to go with the whole thing and I think it makes sense that it probably stays some type of parkland. Jim is the whole thing zoned industrial?

Mr. Jim White commented: No just the portion that we're using.

Mr. Enzien commented: Just that small segment of it there. So I guess that's all I have to say.

Mr. Ouimet commented: Okay thank you, anyone else from the public wish to speak? If not I will close the public hearing. Would any members of the board, any questions? Would someone make a Motion on SEQRA?

Mr. Berkowitz made a motion for the negative declaration of SEQRA, seconded by Mr. Higgins. Motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Berkowitz made a motion to approve the minor subdivision and the special use permit for the baseball fields, seconded by Mr. Roberts. Motion was carried unanimously.

15.018 Subdivision of Lands of N/F ED Properties Inc, & Boundary Line Adjustment with Lands of N/F Marchand, Button Road- Minor Subdivision

Mr. Ouimet commented: Would anyone like the notice read? No one chose to speak.

Mr. Luigi Palleschi of ABD Engineers and Surveyors commented: I am here tonight for a subdivision and lot line adjustment on the east side of Button Road, The zoning is R-1 Residential with 1.45 acres. We are proposing a two-lot residential subdivision and a lot line adjustment. The lot line adjustment includes the 1.82 acre parcel as shown in yellow. The lot line adjustment is basically to adjust the driveway that currently encroaches the property line. We are also adjusting the lot line so the 1.82 acres of land encumbers the entire existing pavement for the driveway for that lot. We are proposing the subdivision as shown in red, creating two lots, lot number 2 at 30,000 SF and lot number 3 at 32,945 SF. We are proposing connections to the public water and on site private septic systems for each individual lot. We meet the minimum zoning that's required for both of these lots and we're not asking for any variances so it's a pretty simple subdivision.

Mr. Ouimet commented: Does anyone from the public wish to speak? If not I'll close the public hearing. Does the Board have any questions?

Mr. Ruchlicki commented: Are the two lots that are being subdivided going to be single family homes?

Mr. Palleschi commented: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Ouimet commented: Do I have a motion on SEQRA?

Mr. Higgins made a motion for the negative declaration of SEQRA, seconded by Mr. Berkowitz. Motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Higgins made a motion to approve the subdivision with lots 2 and 3 being for single family homes, seconded by Mr. Berkowitz. Motion was carried unanimously.

New Business:

15.029 Wal-Mart Seasonal Storage, 1549 Route 9- Change of Use

Mr. Ouimet commented: Is anyone here from the Wal-Mart proposal? No one replied.

The application was tabled due to the fact that the applicant failed to appear.

15.031 The Home Depot, 4 Halfmoon Crossing Blvd- Change of Use

Mr. John Gray Store Manager of 4 Halfmoon Crossing Blvd. commented: I am here for the Home Depot and I'm here to hopefully be granted permission for our outdoor seasonal area for the upcoming year. Nothing has been changed in the last five years that I've been at the store. The area for outside seasonal is going to be a designated area on the side and behind the building for extra holding power for mulch, soils, brick block, things for our customers for our sales that we run for the season.

Mr. Ouimet commented: Are there any questions from the board?

Mr. Higgins commented: Is it going to be in the exact same area it was the previous couple years?

Mr. Gray commented: Yes, nothing has changed everything's been set; this is my sixth year at this particular store. Everything is in the identical same spot.

Mr. Higgins commented: We just wanted to get that on the record. That's all thanks.

Mr. Gray commented: Correct, we are usually out of there by the end of August. We kind of push to get it done early, but you never know what we might run into. We like to put September just in case.

Mr. Berkowitz made a motion to approve the change of use for seasonal sales beginning March 1st. to September 30th, seconded by Mr. Higgins. Motion was carried unanimously.

15.017 Subdivision of 80 Vosburgh Road, 80 Vosburgh Road- Minor Subdivision

Mr. Donald Zee, Attorney commented: I am here representing the Applicant and with me is Ivan Zdrahal, Engineer for the project. What we have is a 16.32 acre parcel located off Vosburgh Road. The lot was originally

part of the Stonecrest Subdivision. We are seeking to subdivide the 16.32 acres into 3 single family residential lots. One lot will have the conventional frontage of 120 feet, second lot, lot number 2 as shown on the plans we proposed it to be a keyhole lot with 20 feet of frontage and lot number 1 with 25 feet of road frontage. We propose that all three lots be served by public water and sewer, approximately 10 acres of the 16.32 acre parcel, currently would be set aside as land preservation, there are some wetland areas there. We would propose a common driveway servicing the 3 lots, the roadway, a common driveway, which would have a cross easement agreement amongst the three lot owners would be 20 feet in width pursuant to the New York State code with regard to fire protection and means of ingress and egress. The sewer line would be pressurized and it would go to a pressurized line, the main line that currently exists where there's currently a manhole. We propose to add a second fire hydrant within the subdivision on a private road; private driveway and we would have a turnaround for emergency vehicles.

Mr. Ouimet commented: Thank you, has this been discussed with the fire district?

Ivan Zdrahal commented: Good evening, I met with Mr. Hunsinger and at the time he told me his concerns, he explained that maybe that there would be some meeting which was planned with the fire chiefs and the Planning Board. I called Art today, I told him basically what I am planning to do. At the time that I spoke with Art I was proposing 18 feet for the driveway, I told him I'm going to go to 20 feet just to comply with the New York State fire code. Basically for the driveway in excess of 500 feet and if its 20 feet wide we don't need a pull out and also we have the **INAUDIBLE** providing the turnaround so I left him a message that we are proposing the driveway to comply with New York State fire code.

Mr. Ouimet commented: Did he reply to your message?

Ivan Zdrahal commented: No, he hasn't responded to me.

Mr. Ouimet commented: Couple of things, the Vice-Chairman and I met with the fire chiefs last week and they indicated to us that for private drives they prefer a 22 foot wide driveway with 2 feet of clearance on either side. In order for them to get their large fire trucks up that length of a driveway, the longer the driveway the harder it is for them to service a fire.

Ivan Zdrahal commented: Well I told him as far as the clearance there is a minimum of 40 feet to be cleared so as far as the clearance he had no issues. As far as the width I personally feel that 20 feet is certainly more than adequate.

Mr. Ouimet commented: Unfortunately the fire chiefs don't agree with you Mr. Zdrahal, that's the problem.

Ivan Zdrahal commented: Well he wasn't, he didn't say yes he didn't say no. He explained to me about some outrigger on his fire truck. Outrigger is outrigger so you support it right. Anyway so I have to finish the conversation with him.

Mr. Ouimet commented: I know so where does that leave us? Well it's clear to me that they want 22 feet, they want 26 feet at the curb for a curb cut so they can swing those trucks in there. What you might end up having is you may end up having a private drive where a fire truck won't go down it and I don't think this board is at all inclined to approve anything that can't be serviced by emergency services.

Mr. Zee commented: If the fire commissioners wanted the 22 feet we would agree to that.

Mr. Ouimet commented: What about the curb cut?

Mr. Zee commented: We would agree to that curb cut as well.

Mr. Ouimet commented: 26 foot?

Mr. Zee commented: Yes.

Mr. Ouimet commented: Do you have enough room for it?

Mr. Zee commented: Plenty of room.

Mr. Ouimet commented: Any other questions from the board?

Mrs. Murphy, Town Attorney commented: Just for purposes of the record Mr. Partlow has recused himself he realized at the beginning of the presentation that he is the adjoining neighbor.

Mr. Ouimet commented: Okay.

Mr. Higgins commented: Regarding the sewer, there's going to be three individual grinder pumps and force mains going out?

Mr. Zdrahal commented: That is correct, those existing **INAUDIBLE** will remain.

Mr. Higgins commented: Right I just wasn't clear that you're going to run three separate.

Mr. Zdrahal commented: No, no we have one main just because the concept is the sewer district there would be a one main brought into the site with an appropriate structures for access and each house will have a separate setup connecting to the sewer main which will commence at this location here.

Mr. Higgins commented: So where are you going to put the pump station?

Mr. Zdrahal commented: It will be inside the houses.

Mr. Higgins commented: The sewer district allowed three separate grinder pumps into one and which of the units is the actual...

Mr. Zdrahal commented: The entire Stonecrest subdivision is on grinder pumps.

Mr. Higgins commented: I understand that, but...

Mr. Zdrahal commented: Same thing.

Mr. Higgins commented: But what's going to force the sewage from where the three houses come together out the 500 feet?

Mr. Zdrahal commented: Each of the grinder pumps have a sufficient pumping capacity to **INAUDIBLE** flow.

Mr. Higgins commented: Mike, are you familiar with that design?

Mr. Bianchino, CHA commented: Yeah, it is low pressure sewer, the thing the county will have to look at, Ivan will have to document to them is the especially in light of the grades that are on that parcel is how long the sewage will be in the line because it's a long line, three sewage pumps, three grinder pumps, but it's not an unusual design,

let me put it that way. But it will have to be documented and the county will have to accept it because that line will have to be a public line, the lower pressure line will have to be public.

Mr. Higgins commented: So the sewer district would have to assume responsibility for maintaining and keeping it open.

Mr. Bianchino, CHA commented: They will have to accept it, how they do their maintenance, I don't know.

Mr. Zdrahal commented: As I said I met with the sewer district and they're okay with the proposal.

Mr. Higgins commented: This is just something we don't see all the time, that's why I asked.

Mr. Ouimet commented: Margaret?

Ms. Sautter commented: Just out of curiosity and I know it's probably jumping the gun a little bit, but the three lots, the lot 3 8.4 acres how much of that is buildable land or useable?

Ivan Zdrahal- All the white space, the portion shaded white is buildable?

Ms. Sautter- Do we know an amount of the 8.4 acres? 5? 4? 3? 1?

Ivan Zdrahal- I would have to scale it, I cannot...

Donald Zee- Approximately an acre and a half.

Ms. Sautter- Is buildable, correct? And now I see in the front, or in the back I'll say that's all wetlands which is the land preservation area?

Ivan Zdrahal- Are you defining the?

Ms. Sautter- Is this it all the shaded area or just where it says land preservation area? Which is behind, to the right of side 1.

Donald Zee- All the shaded area.

Ms. Sautter- All the shaded area, okay. And are you encroaching any of the wetlands there, it doesn't appear to be on this map, no? Okay thank you.

Mr. Ouimet - Any other questions? I think at this point we can schedule a public hearing.

Mr. Roberts commented: Make a motion to schedule a public hearing for next meeting.

Mr. Ouimet- Which is March, 23, 2015.

Mr. Ruchlicki commented: Second. Motion was carried.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Public hearing scheduled for March 23, 2015.

Mr. Ouimet- Do we need an expanded notice Rich?

Mr. Harris- That's your call, I mean there's large land owners around it, I don't know how far you want to go and expand it.

Mr. Ouimet- I'm sorry.

Mr. Harris- I don't know how far you would want to go on an expanded notice for this, I don't, there's some large owners nearby, it's your call.

Mr. Ouimet- What's the board think about an expanded notice? Necessary or not?

Ms. Sautter- I think just looking at the map because it comes out there's a very bad turn there it might be wise. I know we've heard about that turn before in other projects, but it's up to the other members.

Mr. Ouimet- John?

Mr. Higgins- It appears from the map that the two land owners on the upper side are very large land owners and I think it's probably only one house on each of those so I'm more inclined as Margaret mentioned to at least go with people that travel the road around that curve. We have heard people come before us as far as how far down both directions that's, when we say expanded what are we doing, a quarter mile?

Ms. Sautter- You need to define it.

Mr. Harris- We'd have to look at that yeah, we'd have to define that, I mean other times when it's been unclear you've left it to the chairman to decide it before the public notices go out we could take a look at a map and figure it out with John. You know this week if that's the case I would request that you do the public hearing four weeks out to enable us to get it out because otherwise it's got to be in the mail by Friday for the next meeting.

Mr. Higgins commented: It would be a problem if we do the public hearing four weeks from tonight? That's fine.

Mr. Roberts commented: I'll amend my motion to make a motion to have a public hearing at the meeting, what date is it?

Mr. Harris- It actually happens to be five weeks out because we have a three week gap so it's April 13th I think, 12th or 13th, is that a problem, five weeks out from tonight?

Donald Zee- No.

Mr. Harris- It's April 13th.

Mr. Ouimet- That should give you plenty of time to iron out things with the fire district.

Mr. Higgins commented: We also require confirmation from the sewer district and the water department also.

Mr. Harris- Okay I'll talk to water, you talk to sewer. I just like to get it in writing.

Mr. Roberts commented: Ok, I amend my Motion to schedule a Public Hearing for Monday, April 13, 2015 with the expanded notice.

Mr. Berkowitz commented: I will second.

Mr. Ouimet commented: **Motion carried unanimously.**

15.026 Tomhannock Bicycles, 288 Grooms Road- Commercial Site Plan

Chairman Ouimet commented: Do you have a drawing? Oh just the little one.

INAUDIBLE**1:22:12-1:00**

Luigi Palleschi of ABD Engineers and Surveyors- Here tonight for the Tamhannock bike shop it's 288 Grooms Road here with me tonight is Timothy Bonnier. He's under contract with Majorie Russell it's a 1.4 acre parcel. It currently has an existing building on it and part of the proposal will be to demolish that existing building that is right up front on Grooms Road and we're proposing a one story, 4,000 SF office retail building here

Chairman Ouimet commented: What can you tell us about the kind of bicycles that are going to be sold there?

Mr. Palleschi commented: It will be **INAUDIBLE**

Mr. Roberts commented: This will be for sales and service of bicycles only and no other use whatsoever.

Chairman Ouimet commented: You don't switch your product line in the winter.

Mr. Palleschi commented: No I don't.

Chairman Ouimet commented: What kind of traffic do you get at your existing shop?

Mr. Palleschi commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Chairman Ouimet commented: That is not exactly what I mean, I mean in the way of customers?

Mr. Palleschi commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Mr. Ruchlicki commented: What are your proposed delivery times? What type of trucks will be showing up at the facility?

Mr. Palleschi commented: All of our deliveries are done by **INAUDIBLE**

Mr. Ruchlicki commented: How much inventory will you be keeping on site?

Mr. Palleschi commented: I don't know **INAUDIBLE**

Ms. Sautter commented: I would like to make a correction, I don't think it's just an after school program that is at Pal's Day Care it is a full day all day care if I am correct. There are busses there very early in the morning it is a full day all day from 7 am – 5 pm.

Mr. Palleschi commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Ms. Sautter commented: I think it's called Kids Campus. We were told it's the largest Day Care facility and after care program in Halfmoon. It is quite busy and quite large and I have driven by there are there are many busses. So my question with regard to that is could you explain a little bit about your about the easement. I am trying to look at it and I see two ingress and egress on both areas. Are there three, I see where it is labeled but is it that small strip? What was it really meant for? Is it one or two that you own?

Mr. Palleschi commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Ms. Sautter commented: So it is their easement and not your easements?

Mr. Palleschi commented: Correct. The easements are on **INAUDIBLE** to allow access

Ms. Sautter commented: Did it specify two exits and entrances as you have here or do you have three. It is very hard to tell with the island.

Mr. Palleschi commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Mr. Berkowitz commented: Do you really need 2 access points since it is such a low use? Also, why is there so much parking?

Mr. Palleschi commented: Originally we had **INAUDIBLE**

Mr. Berkowitz commented: They are test driving and the Kids Campus parking lot?

Mr. Palleschi commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Mr. Higgins commented: What is the size of the building?

Mr. Palleschi commented: 4,000 SF.

Mr. Higgins commented: It is shown as 50 x 80, correct? And two stories. So it is 2,000 SF per story.

Mr. Palleschi commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Mr. Berkowitz commented: So it is 4,000 SF for the first story?

Mr. Palleschi commented: Correct.

Mr. Higgins and Mr. Berkowitz commented: So it is really 8,000 SF. The basement counts.

Mr. Palleschi commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Mr. Higgins commented: The basement counts. I asked that question at the pre-meeting.

Chairman Ouimet commented: So it's not 2,000 on the show room floor and 2,000 in the basement? It is 4,000 SF for the show room?

Mr. Palleschi commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Mr. Higgins commented: That is 8,000 SF.

Mr. Palleschi commented: That is correct.

Chairman Ouimet commented: 8,000 usable SF in the building.

Mr. Palleschi commented: Correct.

Chairman Ouimet commented: 4,000 SF on the upper level and 4,000 SF in the basement.

Mr. Palleschi commented: The basement level means a 2-story **INAUDIBLE**

Mr. Higgins commented: It's a different classification but it is still square footage. The parking requirement is different for storage and repair shop. Another words no one other than employees are going into the basement. You are going to have anyone, so if someone is having their bicycle worked on and they want to see it you will bring it upstairs for them to look at it.

Mr. Palleschi commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Mr. Higgins commented: Ok, that effects the parking but you still have to have parking allotted for that for storage area or workshop.

Mr. Harris, Director of Planning commented: You have a typically required parking calculation for storage.

Mr. Higgins commented: It is not strictly storage it is also a workshop down there.

Mr. Harris, Director of Planning commented: Within your discretion in terms of the workshop parking we calculate it based on their application of 4,000 SF for retail and that would be 20 parking spaces and they have 33 spaces. That is up to your discretion to determine how many extra spaces they need for the basement of storage and service. I guess it depends on how many employees would be down there. I would use that as a guide at any one time, one or two. I think you have listed 3 employees.

Chairman Ouimet commented: I think there are a couple of things that are throwing me here. I remember when I talked with you on the phone; we talked about a low to moderate intense use for the operation, given the fact that this is in a PR-Professional Office zoned area. There is no retail shop on Grooms Road after you pass Sorrentino's which is closer to the corner of Route 9 then anything else. I look at the size of the building the building is much bigger than what I thought it would be. Then I look at the parking, I am concerned at the parking in the front of the building which is all that you will see from Grooms Road is those cars parked there. That might somewhere you might want to look to do land banking.

Mr. Palleschi commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Chairman Ouimet commented: I am not so clear on your traffic flow pattern in there. If you look at Kids Campus traffic flow it is one way in and it kind of loops around and one way out the other way. You have bi-directional entrances and exits. Is the back entrance and exit for delivery? They are going to take the quickest way in I know the UPS guy's.

Mr. Palleschi commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Chairman Ouimet commented: What thought do you have with sharing the driveway with the daycare center? Kids maybe out there playing in that parking lot.

Mr. Palleschi commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Chairman Ouimet commented: Have you thought about that at all?

Mr. Palleschi commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Chairman Ouimet commented: 10 might be a better time to open up.

Mr. Palleschi commented: That's the time we currently open now.

Chairman Ouimet commented: I don't know. What is the Board's pleasure? Refer it to CHA, we have to refer it to the County Planning, Emergency Services to make sure the flow is good with them. I am thinking to refer it to CHA to tweak the entrances.

Mr. Higgins commented: I am a little bit concerned about the distance off of Grooms for the first entrance with the amount of busses that you have going in there. I am thinking it might be better if you pull it back into the site more. Or make one large entrance and exit. If you get two or three busses backed up going out or coming in there is a lot of busses going in and out of the site I have been by it also. It is a very active site.

Chairman Ouimet commented: I think it is active on short periods of time, I live right by there.

Mr. Palleschi commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Mr. Higgins commented: What time at night does the last child leave about 7 or 6? Then you shut down after that?

Mr. Palleschi commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Chairman Ouimet commented: I think for the record I am going to ask you to come up to put your name on the record. This is all tape recorded for the record.

Mr. Kevin commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Chairman Ouimet commented: A real interesting dilemma that we are faced with here if we can't be satisfied that the use is moderate or light it is not a type of use that fits in that zone. When we originally started this conversation it was zoned PR-Professional Office. That is why we are asking all these questions about timing and spacing and everything else. So you can tell us who you are?

Mr. Greg ? commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Chairman Ouimet commented: You say busses, how many are you talking about?

Mr. Greg commented: **INAUDIBLE** maybe 12.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Throughout the whole day?

Mr. Greg commented: Yes. I **INAUDIBLE**

Chairman Ouimet commented: Do you have any thoughts on the entrance way?

Mr. Greg commented: **INAUDIBLE**

Chairman Ouimet commented: Does the Board have any other questions? At this time we are going to make some referrals: Emergency Services, Saratoga County Planning Board, CHA because of the engineering questions that were raised. Thank you.

15.025 Subdivision Lands of Pettes, 9 Northern Sites Drive- Minor Subdivision

Luigi Palleschi of ABD Engineers and Surveyors- Here tonight for the proposed project on Northern Sites Drive. It's a lot line amendment to provide frontage on Northern Sites Drive for a 3 acre parcel behind 9 Northern Sites Drive. Both the 3 acre parcel and the 9 Northern Sites Drive are owned by Barbera Pettes as part of the estate of Archie Pettes. Archie Pettes, he had died in 2014 so the 3 acre parcel is outlined, 4.76 is outlined on the entire parcel here, there are 2 separate parcels. The 3 acre parcel we're talking about was land locked, but owned by the two properties. Basically what we're proposing tonight is to make the 3 acre parcel in conformance and have road frontage in order to make it a buildable single family residential lot. This is the existing home that Archie had lived in and now the estate owns both of these properties. Northern Sites Drive, it's an existing road; it's a cul-

de-sac and this is a paper street, it was an approved subdivision back in '93 I believe. The reason it's not built yet is due to the water, once water is provided hopefully this would be built out. There's currently a gravel driveway that serves 3 single family homes off of that and as part of the proposed subdivision the home would sit in the back here, it's a 3 acre parcel, plenty of land to build. There's private well, private septic, that would be proposed and then the driveway would come off that shared driveway at the end of Northern Sites Drive. We're aware of the fire code, we feel that it certainly meets the fire code regulations and we can further look into and if need be dress up the gravel area in order to accommodate if it's lacking any regulations for fire code. Again it's in the zoning, we're proposing 3 acres and the minimum is 30,000 SF and I guess at this time I'll turn it over to the board for any questions.

Mr. Ouimet- Thank you, any questions from the board?

Mr. Higgins commented: Have you done test wells to see if there's water on the site?

Luigi Palleschi- We have not back in this area for that site, but there is several approved building lots that have plenty of water and the septic system on site would be a raised bed septic system. There's plenty of room on site to provide both of those.

Mr. Higgins commented: And as far as the paper street which at this point it's not a town road so whose property is the access on?

Luigi Palleschi- So this paper street is zoned by the estate now, as I mentioned back in '93 Pettes, Richie Pettes had developed this site and that paper street is still owned by now the estate.

Mr. Higgins commented: So the estate is going to grant easements to the lot that you want to access plus the other people that are on it now until such time as it becomes a town road.

Luigi Palleschi- Yes, correct. And that language can be drafted.

Mr. Higgins commented: I mean John we had another proposed subdivision at the end of Northern Sites that we required them to do pump tests on the well to make sure that it didn't effect other neighbors because there is an extension of the water line proposed, but it's not coming down anywhere near this site and this area has been notorious for water problems for years so I don't know if that's something we should consider for this site or something to make sure that if somebody goes in there and drills a well other neighbors wells don't go dry. And also about the emergency services access because now instead of one house we have four houses that are going to be accessed off of that gravel drive and you heard earlier tonight the group of fire chiefs that got together are looking at 22 feet with 2 feet on either side capable of supporting a fire truck which is 40,000 pounds.

Luigi Palleschi- Right we'll be willing to provide that or upgrade the...

Mr. Higgins commented: Not just the end, the whole thing, correct?

Mr. Ouimet- Any other questions?

Ms. Sautter- I have a quick question, for the Northern Sites, this was subdivided when the other lots were created. When was this subdivided, you said this was part of the parcel.

Luigi Palleschi- So back in '93 this land back here was subdivided into, I have the plan, but I forget how many lots it goes all the way down to...

Ms. Sautter- Just the two?

Luigi Palleschi- So you're talking about just these two?

Ms. Sautter- Yes.

Luigi Palleschi- So these two were subdivided and this is the existing parcel, lot B and then lot A is here so it created a land locked piece, I probably have that plan here also.

Ms. Sautter- Before or after the 1993?

Luigi Palleschi- I don't have that plan, okay so the 3 acre parcel was created in '99 so it was before the subdivision because that was in '93, right?

Ms. Sautter- So '99 is after?

Luigi Palleschi- '93 correct so this was done after the subdivision.

Mr. Ouimet- So this planning...

Ms. Sautter- Can I see that map, not that map, the map that you just looked at to get the dating?

Luigi Palleschi- I actually took that off the narrative.

Ms. Murphy- There's some concern by the board that there are conditions placed on the subdivision of those two parcels and we'll just have to do some research to see if and what those conditions are.

Luigi Palleschi- I do know that these two parcels were sold off and now they don't own these two parcels of land. That's about all I know.

Mr. Ouimet- Any other questions, John?

Mr. Higgins- Yeah I think we'd be interested because I know Don and I would never have approved a subdivision with land locking a site so that's why I'd be interested in seeing what we approved back then because we're always very cautious about that.

Luigi Palleschi- So all of you are probably familiar with Tom Andress, I'm here for him tonight because he had another obligation, but he did mention to me that when this was subdivided it was supposed to be combined and it never got combined.

Ms. Murphy- So that was a condition of the subdivision...

Luigi Palleschi- So I think that's what you were talking about.

Ms. Murphy- Which is the condition that we we're looking for, but they didn't create **INAUDIBLE** they did by not complying with the condition

Ms. Sautter- So in my mind it's one parcel.

Male voice- So they would have to do a subdivision.

Luigi Palleschi- That's what we're proposing, we're making this lot into conformance by providing this line and then getting frontage.

Mr. Ouimet- Actually it's a bigger subdivision then that. That lot right on the bottom, the land locked parcel is really attached to the lot where the house is because it was never filed, it was never done.

Luigi Palleschi- I don't think this, we'll have to get that map, I don't think this was attached to that I think it was attached to these two and these two were attached and they sort of sold those off. I wish I had that map with me.

Mr. Higgins commented: Yeah, but if it was supposed to be combined and wasn't combined then we're looking at a totally different situation.

Mr. Higgins commented: So who owns that piece of property now?

Luigi Palleschi- These two is Pettes and over here it's Serino.

Mr. Higgins commented: So is that lot originally part of Serino?

Luigi Palleschi- No it was always part of Pettes as far as I was told.

Mr. Higgins commented: You really don't know though, do you?

Luigi Palleschi- I don't. Like I said I'm here for Tom Andress.

Mr. Ouimet- Well I think we're going to have to do some research so I'm going to have to table this until we can sort it out.

Luigi Palleschi- Okay, we can't set a public hearing and sort it out in the meantime?

Mr. Ouimet- I'd be hesitant to set a public hearing, it may take us a while to conclude our research. Alright so what's the board's pleasure, motion to table?

Mr. Berkowitz - Make a motion to table.

Mr. Higgins - I'll second it.

All- aye. Motion carried.

Mr. Ouimet- We'll table it and see where our research leads us.

Luigi Palleschi- Thanks I wish I had more answers tonight. I apologize.

Old Business:

15.022 Sleepys Sign, 1694 Route 9- Sign

Todd Fisher Representing Equinox Company- I've got with me Tom Wheeler of A.J Sign Company. Some of the faces are familiar the little of changes I noticed you have some white name tags and some blue name tags I don't know what the meaning of that is, but I guess I'll find out. I apologize I wasn't here last time, Tyler King was here who's our property manager, but we came in initially with a sign plan for a 15 foot sign at the Sleepys property that had The Crossing at the top of it. I'm sorry I didn't bring enough of these for each one of you, but this was basically what we presented last time. We've gone back to the drawing board and looked at the sign again and Tom has lowered the sign by 3 feet to make it 12 feet high and we've decreased the square footage of the sign from 125 square feet, both of which the square footage and the original heights apparently are authorized by the sign code, but looking at it we feel this is probably a better proportion and we're willing to go with this. We

have deleted from the one you're looking at the notation of The Crossings at the top because in meeting with members of the board we needed to discuss whether this was part of the original PDD. We believe it is and I think where it stands right now it's probably up to Lyn to take a look at that and find out, but we believe it is part of the PDD. Just a quick update on the PDD, back in '93 the original PDD was basically the property that is now occupied by Sunmark, by Country Buffet, no Cracker Barrel sorry, Cracker Barrel and of course the Tower Way, which is the roadway and the vacant land which became a color tile building initially. The Hess gas station was not part of that, but all the land I mentioned was. So the Tower Way became a town road which automatically subdivided basically into 2 parcels, then back in 1998 an amendment to the original ordinance we broke off the other restaurant parcel so that that could be sold. We do not own any of those right now the only piece that we own is the color tile building, but in our feeling it's still part of the PDD. So we're willing to work with what you all want, but we'd still like that branding to see The Crossing up at the top of this and that's basically what we're proposing.

Mr. Ouimet- Don I know that you were part of the committee that went out to take a look at the sign.

Mr. Roberts- Yes we did and we agreed on lowering from 15 to 12 feet so I'm confused as to, you say you want that branding, if that were allowed it would still be 12 feet.

Todd Fisher- That's fine.

Mr. Roberts- I'm saying if it was allowed, I'm not saying it's going to happen, but we're still talking a 12 foot sign anyways.

Todd Fisher- Exactly.

Mr. Wheeler commented: And that's 12 feet from the present paving from grade?

Todd Fisher- Exactly.

Mr. Todd Fisher commented: That's what we discussed when we went there.

So for the other members of the board that were not there the reason for that is the parking lot is really lower and we've got a grade up and we've got the state boundary and I've been told by the state real estate that we can't do anything with their property. So we need to keep this back in the parking lot and we need to have it high enough so that it's seen over the top of that guard rail that's there and I think we determined that that's about 5 feet high. I mean here we're showing 54 inches I don't know why this is in inches it should be in feet.

Mr. Higgins commented: Now one other thing, you're going to take one of the parking spaces that are presently there and you're going to put plantings around it and some bollards and things like that.

Mr. Higgins commented: Rich we just got to make sure that they meet the parking requirements with taking the one parking. We discussed that. Now they have some area where they have some land bank spots, so we just want to make sure, I'm not saying you have to make it a spot, we have to make sure you have room for that.

Todd Fisher- We agree with that.

Mr. Ouimet- Any other questions?

Mr. Roberts comments: And again, Margaret was just asking, right now there's only one tenant, but this is in case you do get another, you do divide it up again and you have two tenants.

Todd Fisher- Yeah, we did have for a long time after color tile left we did have two tenants in there and that's a very very distinct possibility. We're not saying that this bar dividing tenant areas is going to be in there now, but we like that option.

Mr. Higgins commented: So at this point you're looking for an approval based on this and then you can determine or research The Crossing question and come back or...

Todd Fisher- Well we'd like to turn, I mean I'd like the approval on the whole thing, but I realize that the board probably needs more time to research this so we're willing to give that and come back in when we actually go to put copy on because I think, Tom, how would you construct this?

Tom Wheeler- This would be an aluminum face then the letters would be cut into the aluminum backed in acrylic so just the word The Crossings would light up not the whole face. We could have conditional approval, I could build most of the sign and then come in for that piece later.

Mr. Higgins commented: We had talked about possibly putting, if you don't put The Crossing up there then maybe the address. Is that a possibility if, or would you rather keep it just blank?

Todd Fisher- I don't really know the answer to that question I think we'd like to leave that up in the air right now, we really would like that branding with The Crossing.

Mr. Higgins commented: Well again that's for Lyn to determine.

Todd Fisher- Well I think that all depends on whether you determine I mean without pushing you guys into a corner I understood that that's why we needed to remove that because we thought it wasn't part of The Crossings.

Mr. Ouimet- Well the issue is, it's either part of The Crossings then theoretically you can have a sign that says Crossings on it, if it's not if it's an off premise sign you can't have that.

Todd Fisher- That's exactly what we understood. So I guess the question is it's a legal question of whether it's still part of The Crossing or not.

Mr. Ouimet- I have a different question for you. If this sign is approved how close will it be to your existing large Crossing sign which is on the opposite side of the roadway that goes in and out of the building.

Todd Fisher- Well I think John and Don can back me up on this, but I'd say it's probably 125 feet.

Mr. Higgins commented: Yeah we were thinking it was more like 80 feet or so, but we didn't actually physically go out there and measure it, but you know we...

Todd Fisher- Well the right away is probably 60 feet alone and then...

Mr. Higgins - That's what he means right away 60.

Todd Fisher- And then we've got those parking space that are all 10 feet each and there's probably 4 or 5 of them at least.

Mr. Ouimet- But you're existing sign is on the south side of the driveway, correct?

Todd Fisher- Correct, the current...

Mr. Ouimet- And how high is that?

Todd Fisher- You know I don't know, but it's higher than 16 feet I want to say it's probably 25 feet.

Mr. Ouimet- So it's clearly visible right? And this sign would be 12 feet which would be half way up that sign and it would say the same thing, The Crossings.

Todd Fisher- Correct. Yes that's right and right now we're in the process...

Mr. Ouimet- But it wouldn't identify a driveway or anything like that it would just identify the building as being part of The Crossings?

Todd Fisher- Well we're also in the process with Tom of redoing some of our Crossing signs also the one in Clifton Park and we very well may do that to the sign that's in Halfmoon. So I'd like to keep our options open there if we can, I'd like you to consider The Crossing idea.

Mr. Ouimet- It just seemed to some of us that it was redundant and you didn't really need The Crossings on that sign, it will be better with a street address.

Todd Fisher- Yeah for the same reason that Target has two signs that say Target and Home Depot has...

Mr. Ouimet- No, I understand.

Todd Fisher - Less people know that that building is essentially part of The Crossings.

Mr. Ouimet- So I guess the question is do we...

Ms. Murphy- The language of the PDD clearly includes the tile building, but the maps on my planners are telling me don't so do you have the original map for the PDD?

Todd Fisher- I can look.

Ms. Murphy- That's what we need to see. Reading through the language it looks like that building is part of the PDD, but when you pull the maps that are referenced, like in this amendment in '98, that map shows Cracker Barrel, it doesn't show the tile store.

Todd Fisher- Correct and that's because that particular amendment I remember this now if you read through it, originally a PDD was for a hotel, a restaurant, and a bank. So the color tile became the bank, the restaurant became Hardy's initially and then the other piece was the hotel which then the ordinance you're talking about actually allowed them two restaurants because that was a time when there were really two restaurants there. So I think Lyn if you go back to '93 you'll see there's a meets and bounds description there of the PDD and I have to really look at that its up at the very beginning of it.

Ms. Murphy- That's '92 you amended the meets and bounds survey.

Todd Fisher- Yeah I guess it was it '92, yeah whatever.

Ms. Murphy- Yeah sorry, there was one in '93 as well. So I will have them space that out on the map as well.

Todd Fisher- I believe that honestly that is the PDD, the whole thing was the PDD.

Ms. Murphy- It's all here in the PDD language it's just the maps are contradicting.

Todd Fisher-I got the one map I'll see if I can find the other one.

Mr. Harris- Well also interesting the sign, the large sign that says The Crossing is located on property that our zoning map shows as not being the PDD, also today, it's on property zoned C1, so even the large Crossing Sign that you're talking about is not on PDD property according to the zoning map.

Todd Fisher- Yeah and what happened there was when Crossing Boulevard was built we were left with this gore over there, in fact there's two of them I think along Crossing Boulevard that are actually in the Town of Halfmoon. There's two very small gores that were left.

Ms. Sautter- Two very small what?

Todd Fisher- A gore is a piece of property that remains from a subdivision that really basically, nobody knows what to do with. We still get a tax bill on it.

Mr. Roberts - So John can we approve the 12 foot sign tonight and leave the top open for?

Ms. Murphy- Well you can approve it contingent on it being on the PDD and if it's not in the PDD they don't get The Crossings language.

Todd Fisher- Fair enough.

Mr. Ouimet- Do I have a motion?

Mr. Roberts - Yeah I'll make a motion approve the 12 foot sign as presented contingent on, how do I word this, we're approving the sign, but I mean we're gonna, the wording on top is questioned.

Todd Fisher- In order to get to that point you need me to provide you with the subdivision map or are you just going to take the meets and bounds?

Ms. Murphy- Are you guys comfortable?

Mr. Harris- I'd say a map, a map would help us for records in the future if it comes up. Definitely figure it out.

Todd Fisher- I think I can do that.

Mr. Higgins commented: And Don the 12 foot is from present grade. I'll second it.

Ms. Murphy- We didn't finish it.

Mr. Roberts - Well let me finish, I'll make a motion to approve the 12 foot sign as presented at grade and if it's proven that this building is part of The Crossings they can add The Crossing on top of the 12 foot sign, keeping it 12 foot total.

Mr. Higgins - I'll second it.

All- aye. Motion carried.

15.019 Valente Office Building, 118 Button Road- Minor Subdivision & Change of Use

John Higgins recused himself.

Dean Marotta of RJ Valente- I was up here a few weeks ago to talk about separating the office parcel from 118 Button Road and I think we tabled it because we had to figure out, we wanted Lyn to do some investigation on how this could be done, if it could be done at all.

Mr. Ouimet- Lyn I know you were asked to look at it.

Ms. Murphy- Right so I have advised the board basically what I'm waiting to hear from DEC right now is whether the buildings themselves are still part of your Life of Mine because the permit that we have on file for you is expired, but we have a letter from DEC saying that you were removing the buildings from the Life of Mine.

Dean Marotta- This is all coming in the same breath. We're up for re-approval of the mine this year, we're in that process, we did tell them that we were going to contact the town to see if we could remove it, so that's where that's coming from.

Ms. Murphy- Okay it's like in 2008 where DEC tells us they're removing the buildings from your permit, so I need to figure that out with them. That being said if the buildings are out of your Life of Mine permit and you're not required to tear them down as part of your reclamation the subdivision could go forward, you couldn't use it as a commercial use unless you got a variance from the ZBA allowing for commercial use in that, because it will revert to the AR zoning.

Dean Marotta- Right.

Ms. Murphy- So as soon as we have the answer on the Life of Mine, which they haven't called me back, we can go forward with the subdivision, but you have to know that the ZBA may tell you no or they may say yes.

Dean Marotta- Okay is there anything that we can do to help you?

Ms. Murphy- If you, I don't know if your attorney has the Life of Mine current permit that they can show us.

Dean Marotta- I can dig that up.

Ms. Murphy- Okay, that would be helpful.

Dean Marotta- And then just I'll bring it into Rich and he can get it to you?

Ms. Murphy- Yes he will get it to me.

Mr. Ouimet- I have a question for you. One of the impetuses for doing this would be for the removal of the truck traffic on Brookwood Road? How realistic is that given the fact that the mining operation is going to continue?

Dean Marotta- The mining, in that mine has diminished considerably in the past 5 years, where we do use material, there out of there, but the trucks are all parked there, they're maintained there because that was our main station. We have an opportunity now to move them to a different location if we can justify the revenues of moving out of there. If it's not justifiable we'll just stay there and maintain it because the mine will last for years, I mean with the current way we're using the material out of there at this point we'll be there for years. But we just thought it was beneficial for both RJ Valente and the town to have the trucks removed and have a less of a nuisance person there.

Mr. Ouimet- Right but they won't really be removed, removed, they'll still be some truck traffic.

Dean Marotta- Yes there will.

Mr. Ouimet- But it will be significantly less is what you're saying.

Dean Marotta- I would say it's significantly diminished, yes, because they won't go there everyday and every morning, they'll be somewhere else.

Mr. Ouimet- Nor will they be stored there or will some still?

Dean Marotta- No they will not be stored there.

Mr. Ouimet- None will stay there? So they'll have to come from Troy or wherever you're gonna have them?

Dean Marotta- That's what we're wanting to move them Troy to a different facility.

Mr. Ouimet- I think what we need to do at this point in time is schedule a public hearing.

Ms. Murphy- But, again so you understand.

Dean Marotta- I do understand that and I'm slightly cautious about that because I know, whether they have it mixed up or I'm pretty sure our records are pretty straight it is still part of the mine. Because we've talked to them about removing it and they said okay you've got to do this, this, and this and we've been doing that in the past several weeks. **Mike Roff?** has been doing that for me from CT Mail, separating it and doing the drawings for them to look at so I really don't know, there's a lot of arms to DEC so I don't know who you're talking to.

Ms. Murphy- Yeah and that's our concern because we don't have, if part of your reclamation is to tear down the building we can't stop that so they're going to tear down the building. DEC is going to outweigh this board.

Dean Marotta- That's correct. What we're asking them is the same thing, we're asking you to separate it for sale of the property so they're being asked the same thing as you are simultaneously. So I'm a little confused, but it's not to say that it's not happening because you could very well be talking to somebody that we're not talking to. So I guess I'll get my information on who we've been speaking to and asking our questions and I'll get that over to you as well as an updated permit showing that they're still in the Life of Mine. I don't want to remove, I don't want to subdivide that until I know what we're doing with zoning.

Mr. Ouimet- So do you want to come back in two weeks and then we'll see what happens?

Dean Marotta- Yeah I'll get all that information for you so you can get straight with DEC on which direction they're going.

Mr. Ouimet- Does two weeks work for you or is five better because our next meeting...

Dean Marotta- I think I can get it done in two weeks, if I cant I can always postpone it, but I feel confident I can get it done.

Mr. Harris- The only thing about postponing it is if it's in two weeks we have to send notices out by Friday this week.

Mr. Ouimet- No no no we're not going to set the public hearing tonight. Because you may not want, if it doesn't flow the way you think it will.

Dean Marotta- We'll just do business as usual.

Mr. Ouimet- There's no point in subdividing.

Dean Marotta- Let me try to research all the information you're looking for, making sure you have all the pertinent documents and then I'll find out where CT Mail is with this and see who we're talking to.

Mr. Ouimet- So we'll adjourn and reschedule it for two weeks from now.

Dean Marotta- Yes sir.

Mr. Ouimet- Okay, very good thank you very much.

Ms. Murphy- And Joe has my cell if he has any questions.

14.128 421 Halfmoon Flex Park PDD, 421 Route 146- Site Plan/ Planned Development District Recommendation

Jason Dell of Lansing Engineering- Also with me is Alanna Moran she's an engineer with Creighton Manning, they did the traffic study for the project as well as Dean Taylor who is the realtor for the applicant. To give you a brief overview of the project and then we'll get right into what was revised per our meeting last time as well as answer questions that you folks had at the last meeting. So the site is located along the northern side of Route 146, it is located immediately east of Parkford Road and west of Enterprise. The project site is comprised of two parcels and a portion of a third parcel. The first parcel is 6.87 acres, it encompasses the large central portion of the site and northern, there's a smaller .61 acre parcel which was formally a residence located along Route 146 and 1.9 acres of the existing 4 Enterprise Drive parcel. Now the two parcels I mentioned first are both zoned C1 commercial and the 1.9 acre area of 4 Enterprise is currently part of the NYSEG PDD. So the proposed project will include the construction of two buildings, the first of which will be 44,000 square feet and the second building will be a 15,000 square foot manufacturing in Flex Space buildings. The buildings are to be true flex space and utilized by multiple entities and they will be used for both manufacturing, storage and distribution of goods. The proposed development will provide parking in accordance with the Town of Halfmoon zoning requirements. Access to the site will be provided by an entrance from Route 146. Water will be supplied to the project from a connection to the municipal system located along Route 146. Initial discussions with the water department indicated that they had sufficient capacity to satisfy the project. Sanitary sewer will be provided to the project by connection to the Saratoga County system located along 146. Initial discussions with the sewer district and per a meeting with them, they have sufficient capacity in their force main along there to accommodate the project and storm water will be managed on site in accordance with all required regulations. The objectives of the project will require the parcels before mentioned to be included within the zoning with the Parkford Plan Development District, as that PDD incorporates the Town of Halfmoon M1 industrial zoning requirements. Approximately 1.9 acres will be proposed to be removed from the NYSEG PDD and then included with the two aforementioned parcels and then joined in with the Parkford PDD. Now since the last meeting as we were before this board back in October of 2014, the board had several questions that we were tasked with answering in coming back before. The largest one was the traffic study and a traffic study was performed, the report was submitted to the town and it was reviewed and Alanna Moran, as I mentioned before is here to answer any questions you folks may have regarding that traffic study. Through the review process CHA provided several comment letters, we responded to them. As a result of that the requested 50 foot landscaped and fenced buffer has been provided between the project and the adjacent residential areas. In order to accommodate that the building size was reduced, previously the larger building was 45,500 square feet, now the larger building has been reduced by 1,500 square feet down to 44,000 square feet. Another comment was regarding the access road in off of Route 146, before it was at an angle not 90 degrees. CHA had mentioned that a 90 degree approach would be preferable so we revised the plan to incorporate that 90 degree access road. Mr. Higgins I believe that at the last meeting you had requested us to take a look at alternate routes into the property, most notably from Parkford as well as if we could come from Enterprise. You can see in the larger aerial photograph over there along the floor, you can see along the western boundary of the northern portion of the site, are wetlands which is one item. Additionally the applicant's agent had contacted those landowners and they were either not interested or did not return any phone calls. As far as connecting into the project from 4 Enterprise, there is a stream corridor as well as some steep slopes and wetlands so connecting in from the east would not be

practical at all we would have to bridge all of that. Mr. Ouimet you had asked how far to the east the Halfmoon Medical Facility was to our entrance and I don't know if you can see the outline on the bottom, that's the Halfmoon Medical entrance, it's approximately 220 feet to our east so there is ample distance away from where that entrance is to where we're proposing to come out to Route 146. Mr. Berkowitz you had asked what the percentage of green space was minus the wetland area, as we've got 51% green space now if you take out the wetlands we've got 29% green space. Mr. Roberts you we're concerned about the vehicles backing out into the main access road coming up and in over in this area there was parking, we've since revised the plan to remove the parking from that area to alleviate that concern. Other items, we performed an archaeological investigation that report was submitted to shippo, we do have a sign off letter from them indicating we will not have an adverse impact on cultural resources and we've also got a letter back from DEC indicating that there are no known threatened or endangered species on the site. So at this point in time as I mentioned before we've addressed all of CHA's comments to this point and we're back tonight to update the board and ask the board to move the project forward as you guys see fit.

Mr. Ouimet- Thank you. Michael I know the last time we looked at this project we referred it to you, have your concerns, I know you raised a number of concerns in your various review letters, have they been addressed?

Mr. Bianchino- Yeah I think the plans have been revised and tried to address some of the concerns we had and so on there's some engineering issues that we raised that I think Jason has responded to in such a way that we feel comfortable going forward with those engineers. So from a PDD approval standard I think they've done everything that we've asked of them.

Mr. Ouimet- Thank you. Any questions from the board?

Mr. Higgins - I guess I'm just concerned that the majority of the parking for workers in the building is in the back and they're going to be walking past all these tractor trailers, backing in and out to get to the building. The building number one isn't quite as bad, but building number two, you have four parking spaces with a walk way. You're portraying this as a necessity because there isn't this type of an application in the area for manufacturing and flex space, but manufacturing requires people and I don't see how people parking all the way in the back of the site are going to safely get into the buildings as far as, especially in this type of weather where snow is piled all over the place. That's my concern and also the single access in and out of the site, between the number of cars that are going to be going in and out of there and shift changes and trucks and we all know the traffic on 146 already is tough, especially if they're trying to go across the lanes and go in the opposite direction. I don't know it just seems you might be trying to put too much on this site.

Jason Dell- I certainly understand your concern, our initial plan that we provided had significantly more parking up front, and we had 61 stalls up in front to service the two buildings. To accommodate the requested buffer as well as to remove it from the parking aisle we had to shift that parking to the back and where as we understand that your concern about the distance from them to walk it is also as you mentioned more of a shift type work or manufacturing so they will be predominately employee parking and as far as your trip generation and that sort of thing I'm sure Alayna could answer any questions you have on that.

Mr. Higgins - Is there a reason why you couldn't have put, and maybe it's wetlands, but it's shown as trees, just I guess west of building number two?

Jason Dell- Yes there's wetlands back there.

Mr. Higgins - That's wetlands in there?

Jason Dell- Yes

Mr. Higgins - Okay because it's not shown on the map that we have as wetlands so.

Mr. Berkowitz - You couldn't put a sidewalk along there for a path for people to come into building two, just to make that a little safer?

Jason Dell- Sure we could put a sidewalk there.

Mr. Berkowitz - This way you keep people out of the parking lot.

Jason Dell- Sure.

Mr. Ouimet- Jason the entrance into building one, is that going to be over on the side that has the, well I guess for a lack of a better way of describing it, less parking spaces? No the other side. What I'm trying to do is figure out whether the employees that are going into building one are going to have to walk in back of those trucks.

Jason Dell- There would be a rear entrance into the building as well it wouldn't just have one entrance in the front, there would be multiple entrances. We don't have the exact building architecture.

Mr. Ouimet- So if the employees entered from that back entrance then they wouldn't have to walk behind the trucks.

Jason Dell- On this side?

Mr. Ouimet- They wouldn't have to walk across the loading dock area and then in the front of the building, right, if they could enter from the back?

Jason Dell- Correct.

Mr. Higgins - Well that's only if there's only one tenant taking the whole building.

Jason Dell- Correct this will be true flex space so there is the potential that there could be multiple tenants.\

Mr. Higgins - You could have three or four tenants in there.

Mr. Ouimet- It all depends on how you carve the building up.

Mr. Higgins - Yeah exactly that's the point I was trying to make is depending on how they carve the building up you may have entrances in between the loading dock areas.

Jason Dell- And we would be back obviously for site plan approval and then any uses would have to come before this board because there may not be a tractor trailer there. You know so there truly is a flexible nature to this project.

Mr. Higgins - You could also put an inner corridor running down the length of that building that would just solve all those problems.

Jason Dell- Correct.

Mr. Ouimet- Okay, thanks. Any other questions?

Ms. Sautter- Quick question, for the wetlands, I see, are you indicating with those, I see the 1,800 square foot of wetlands disturbance and then another 475 and then another 1,700.

Jason Dell- Yeah we have just shy of a tenth of an acre of disturbance for the project.

Ms. Sautter- But those are all, that's where you're indicating where they are?

Jason Dell- Yes.

Ms. Sautter- Okay, and this here the underground, you said use a combination of underground storage and/or porous pavement. Yet you also say asphalt parking area so are they going to be two different things?

Jason Dell- No underground storage is used all the time in parking lots now, it's subsurface chambers or subsurface pipes, your asphalt would discharge to catch basins which would go to a sub surfaced detention facility which will either infiltrate or have an outlet structure in a conveyance mechanism. Permeable asphalt is basically its own storm water management system, the water just goes right through the pavement. When we get into the detailed design and we do additional sub surfaced investigation we'll have a better idea of what type of storm water system we would have to do in order to meet the DEC regulations.

Ms. Sautter- Well that was the question, it said and or so further down the line you'll know. I'm just curious because of the amount of wetlands on that site, I was just thinking about that. Okay thank you.

Mr. Ouimet- Any other questions?

Mr. Roberts - Now I'm not sure what you can do about it John, but I agree with John Higgins from looking at this plan about the concern about only one access, especially we're always concerned about access being cut off in an emergency situation and especially at a site like this where all these tractor trailers, I mean that's a real concern, but I'm not sure what you can do about it.

Mr. Ouimet- Rich was this referred to emergency services?

Mr. Harris- No it was not we left it to see what the board's comments were. **INAUDIBLE**

Mr. Ouimet- So it hasn't been referred outside of the planning board?

Mr. Harris- Sorry I just gave it to Art at our meeting the other night.

Mr. Ouimet- So all of those external reviews are pending at this point?

Mr. Harris- Yes they're pending.

Mr. Ouimet- Have you had any discussion with the fire department up there?

Jason Dell- No we were under the impression that the town was coordinating that with Steffen?

Mr. Ouimet- But you haven't had any independent conversation?

Jason Dell- No sir.

Mr. Ouimet- I think all of that stuff will be before the Town Board, they have to take this up anyway so. But since the traffic engineer is here lets hear from her as to that issue.

Alanna Moran of Creighton Manning Engineering- We completed the traffic study for this particular project, can I just go through briefly what we did and then if you have any questions about it we can go from there?

Mr. Ouimet- Quickly because I think our only question has to do with one way in.

Alanna Moran- Is it just the access? Alright well the site is only anticipated to generate during the peak hours like 42 trips during the AM peak hour and 43 trips during the PM peak hour. One trip every one and half minutes or so. That is well below the DOT and ITE threshold for needing any type of offsite analysis and it's typically below the need for any type of additional access points to the site. It's expected to operate at level of service D or better which is about 32 seconds during the PM peak hour and about 22 seconds during the AM peak hour with a single lane exiting the site and stop sign control. So from a capacity standpoint there is no need for any type of additional access to the site.

Mr. Ouimet- Okay, thank you. That addresses capacity it doesn't have anything to do with emergency.

Mr. Higgins - And not only that single lane coming out, so if you have a tractor trailer that's trying to make a left hand turn coming out of the site at rush hour I don't care whether it's morning or evening, you're telling me that it's only going to be less than a minute before that truck, because right now on 146 we have other people telling us that they're sitting there for minutes and I know Tom and I go to the dump on Saturday mornings and just trying to get out by the church there, you'll sit there for two or three minutes on a Saturday morning.

Mr. Ouimet- 22 seconds sometimes feels like five minutes when you're sitting.

Mr. Higgins - No it's lengthy. It's a minute or two at least on a Saturday when traffic is theoretically quiet.

Alanna Moran- Well I can tell you that on average the analysis shows that it will be about 30 seconds during the peak hour and yes the impression of when you're actually sitting there waiting it feels so much longer than it actually is when we calculate it out.

Mr. Ouimet- Other questions?

Jason Dell- As far as to go a little further into the one entrance point, the size of it, before you mentioned they wanted everything to be 26 feet wide for emergency services. Our access road coming in we widened to 28 feet already, so

Mr. Ouimet- But I think you're going to need that for the tractor trailers aren't you?

Jason Dell- Correct, but also fire services requires that same.

Mr. Ouimet- Now can two vehicles pass in that driveway?

Jason Dell-Yes

Mr. Ouimet- So you can enter even though someone is waiting to make a turn out?

Jason Dell- On the black and white you can see we super imposed the turning radius of an emergency vehicle.

Mr. Higgins - You didn't consider making that three lanes, one lane in and two lanes out so that people hoping to make a left aren't stacking up to people that can make a right.

Alanna Moran- No we didn't and the reason is that this driveway is going to require a work permit from New York State DOT and DOT's preference for an unsignalized driveway onto a state maintained roadway is typically to have a single lane exiting the site. The reason that they like to do that is because when a vehicle is waiting to turn left out of the site they'll keep sneaking out a little bit further and further and then somebody waiting to turn right out of the site they can't see by that other vehicle in the left turn lane in order to actually see when they can turn right. So that's why DOT, there current standard is to maintain just a single lane exiting in an unsignalized location.

Mr. Higgins - So at a shift change lets say you have 15 cars exiting, at 30 seconds each that's roughly 7 minutes for the last car to get up and be able to get out of the parking lot, correct?

Alanna Moran- It's an average of 30 seconds sometimes people are going to hit a gap of 10 seconds to get out some other vehicles may have to wait 40 seconds to get out. The other part of this is similar to when I leave my office, there's a bunch of people that might leave at 4:30, it still doesn't mean that we're all getting in our cars and leaving immediately at 4:30. Everybody takes just a little bit longer to get in and out there tends to be a little bit more space and variation between that exiting traffic it's not like 15 people are going to get in our cars and all be waiting in line together to get out there will be more variation in the pattern change then that.

Mr. Higgins - Eventually there's going to be a stop light at the entrance of the medical park?

Alanna Moran- Yes that is one of those approval, one of the mitigation measures for that.

Mr. Higgins - Now has that been taken into context with this site here?

Alanna Moran- It is not with this site the build out for this site is a much shorter term than the medical facility.

Mr. Higgins - But what in your opinion would that do to?

Alanna Moran- Essentially what would happen is there would be some gaps created by the traffic signals, so some platooning effect so that when traffic on Route 146 is stopped and vehicles might be exiting from the medical office facility or the medical buildings that will create some more space in traffic for anybody in an unsignalized approach like this site to enter flow of traffic without having a relatively consistent variation in traffic. Instead it's going to be a bunch of platoons that would pass by the site. So it creates a greater gap for vehicles to exit.

Mr. Higgins - So will that improve the site or make it worse? Or will it have no effect?

Alanna Moran- Generally the adjacent signal will improve an unsignalized access like this.

Mr. Higgins - Do you know when that stop light is supposed be installed?

Alanna Moran- I believe it's all dependent on when the medical offices get built?

Mr. Berkowitz - Is that after the Alzheimers place is built or during?

Ms. Murphy- Probably after, how many trips before the lights triggered from the medical campus? There has to be more than that.

Mr. Berkowitz – Probably about 2 or 3.

Alanna Moran- You're probably going to need to generate a couple hundred trips from the medical office before it signals a traffic signal.

Mr. Ouimet- Yeah you're going to need a bigger build out then just that memory care for something. Now Lyn it's my understanding that the Town Board will have to have a public hearing before it acts on the request.

Ms. Murphy- Yes that is correct.

Mr. Ouimet- So I don't see any reason unless folks on the board feel otherwise for this board to have a public information meeting. Since the public hearing will be held by the Town Board before it considers their request. So I guess the next step for us is to make a recommendation to the Town Board.

Mr. Roberts - Before we do that though Jason you agree to put the sidewalk in right?

Jason Dell- Yes.

Mr. Roberts - Make a motion to make a positive recommendation to the Town Board.

Mr. Berkowitz - I'll second.

John Higgins- voted no. All else voted aye.

Mr. Ouimet- Any particular reason John you want the Town Board to know?

Mr. Higgins- Just because I'm really concerned about the access onto 146. I just think it's going to create a real bottle neck there and what's going to happen is people are going to get frustrated waiting to try to get and out and their going to take chances and we're going to have a bunch of accidents. And also the fact that the traffic trying to get out I think that we're going to be hamstringing the emergency people if they ever had to try to get a fire truck or an ambulance in that size of an entrance way at the same time.

Mr. Ruchlicki made a motion to adjourn seconded by Mr. Berkowitz seconded.

Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Harris
Director of Planning