

Town of Halfmoon Planning Board

Meeting Minutes – September 10, 2012

Those present at the September 10, 2012 Planning Board meeting were:

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

Director of Planning: Jeff Williams
Planner: Lindsay Zepko

Town Attorney: Lyn Murphy

Town Board Liaisons: Walt Polak

CHA Representative: Mike Bianchino

Mr. Watts opened the September 10, 2012 Planning Board Meeting at 7:01 pm. Mr. Watts asked the Planning Board Members if they had reviewed the August 27, 2012 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the August 27, 2012 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried.

New Business:

12.075 NB Cole's Collision Center, 1629 Route 9 – Sign

Mr. Tom Wheeler, of A J Signs, stated the following: We are proposing 2 new signs on the new Cole's building located on Route 9 that was formerly Lee's Plaza. The proposal includes a wall-mounted sign to be placed on the Route 9 facing façade of the building and will read the company name and logo. The second sign is a double-sided freestanding sign that is proposed to be placed on the north side entrance of the driveway to the site. A portion of the freestanding sign has "red bands" that are similar to neon that would be a LED rope light that would go around the sign that would glow with a digital display area. Mr. Roberts asked what do you mean by "similar to neon"? Mr. Wheeler stated LED has replaced neon but it looks just like neon and it would be a round tube that is filled with LED's rather than being filled with neon gas and it would provide the same glow. Mr. Roberts stated we're concerned about the brightness. Mr. Wheeler stated the brightness is very similar to neon. Mrs. Murphy stated the following: Neon isn't permitted here unless it's enclosed in and it looks like it is enclosed in backlighting something. So when you say neon, exposed neon isn't permitted. So, I'm assuming that it is not exposed LED. Mr. Wheeler stated it actually is exposed LED. Mr. Ouimet asked is the level of lighting controlled and will it take into consideration ambient light and tone itself down when it gets darker? Mr. Wheeler stated yes, the LED display has an auto-dimming feature. Mr. Higgins stated no, we are referring to the red band rope lights and if they would vary in intensity also? Mr. Wheeler stated no, they are consistent.

Mr. Ouimet stated the following: But, they're consistent how? Are they consistent bright or consistent moderate bright? Mr. Wheeler stated it's the same technology that's inside a channel letter where they don't need to be on during the day. Mr. Ouimet stated you say that the digital display has intensity modulation, right? Mr. Wheeler stated yes, that has an auto-dimming feature. Mr. Ouimet the following: If it is illuminated as brightly as it could be, is it equal to the red strips or less or greater? Is the red strip as bright as the brightest setting on the digital display? Mr. Wheeler stated if this display were 100% at night, you wouldn't even be able to look at it. Mr. Ouimet stated I'm trying to find out how bright the red strips are. Mr. Wheeler stated the following: The LED bands would not be that bright. It would take away from the whole sign if it was that bright and it wouldn't be effective. Mr. Berkowitz stated how is it compared to an exit sign? Mr. Wheeler stated they are similar. Mr. Watts stated the following: The problem that we have is that during the day it's not bad but if you're driving down Route 9 or coming down Route 236 from about a 1/2-mile away you can see the sign in front of Walgreens. We don't allow the signs to change within a 24-hour period, which most other municipalities do allow. We find that these things are, in some cases, depending on where they are and where they are located, are very visually distracting. When you leave here tonight and you see the sign at Walgreens on Route 9, you will see where that sign starts to hit you and it's very bright. Mr. Wheeler stated the following: We have another way that we can do these bands that would soften it. Rather than have exposed tubes, I could use a "C" channel and put LED's on the inside. So, that would provide a soft glow around and it would definitely soften the light a lot because there would be aluminum in front of it. Mr. Higgins asked why do you even need those? Mr. Wheeler stated because it looks cool. Mr. Watts stated I don't want to see someone driving down Route 9 and looking over there at a bright light because that would cause safety issues and that's what we are concerned about. Mr. Wheeler stated the following: I fully understand and I can definitely soften these. I also understand that we're not going to have a flashing, scrolling or animated sign. It's basically a modern-day message board rather than having to go out and change the letters. Mr. Watts asked what kind of things would you put on a message board that needs to change at Cole's Collision? Mr. Wheeler stated the following: They would advertise their services and Mr. Cole is very aggressive with his marketing and he would do whatever he could to get people in the door. They may also do community events because Mr. Cole is very into the community. Mr. Higgins stated the following: Regarding just the red portion; could you tone that down to the 500 NITS even during the day? Personally, I don't see that you need the red bands that bright. Mr. Wheeler stated the following: If I did these as a halo lit object, during the day you would see red bands and they would be aluminum with no light behind them. At night it would just glow softly around the edges rather than the exposed tube. Mr. Higgins asked could you give us an idea of what the NITS at night would be on just the red portion? Mr. Wheeler stated I couldn't tell you how many NITS that would be. Mr. Berkowitz stated we would have to know this. Mr. Higgins stated if the rest of the sign is limited to 500 NITS, I think those also would have to be limited to 500 NITS. Mr. Roberts stated I think that is a good idea and I agree with Mr. Higgins. Mr. Nadeau asked does Cole's Collision have two other locations? Mr. Wheeler stated Cole's has three other locations; Wilton, Ballston Spa and Colonie. Mr. Nadeau asked do they have a similar sign at their other locations? Mr. Wheeler stated this proposed sign on the building is identical to their other locations and the other three locations do not have freestanding signs because they are not allowed. When you did Casale's sign, did that have the same limitation on the 500 NITS? Mr. Nadeau stated yes. Mr. Wheeler this is a very similar display to the Casale's sign. Mr. Berkowitz stated Casale's doesn't have the red borders. Mr. Wheeler stated the following: This portion of the sign would not be nearly as bright as any of the rest of the sign. If I did it as a halo lit, it would be very very soft and then these would be standard channel letters like all the other channel letters in Town. This is a good display that has

auto-dimming. Mr. Berkowitz asked if it is not nearly as bright as the top portion of the sign, how bright is the top portion of the sign? Mr. Wheeler stated they are typical channel letters just like the Home Depot or Target. Mr. Roberts stated the following: I think we should put the same restriction on Cole's as we put on Casale's. How tall is the freestanding sign? Mr. Wheeler stated 162.5-inches from grade to the top. Mr. Roberts stated in this area, we try to keep the signs at 12 FT and you are over 13 FT. Mr. Wheeler stated we did that just to keep it up out of the snow and they can landscape around it. Mr. Roberts asked could you lower it to 12 FT? Mr. Wheeler stated if we had to, we could. Mr. Roberts stated I think that would be the way to go. Mr. Ouimet stated I agree with Mr. Roberts because the Casale's sign is 12 FT. Mr. Higgins stated it is 12 FT above ground level or from grade. Mr. Wheeler stated okay, I could make that work. Mr. Higgins stated the following: The 500 NITS would be the nighttime maximum for the entire sign. In other words, even the red portion of it cannot exceed the 500 NITS at night. We just want to go on record to make sure that it's clearly in the record that way so if it's too bright, Code Enforcement can do something about it. Mr. Roberts stated also the advertising can only change once every 24 hours. Mr. Ouimet stated and the daytime intensity should be 7,000 NITS maximum. Mr. Wheeler stated okay. Mr. Roberts stated and the sign cannot scroll or be animated either. Mr. Wheeler stated I completely understand what you are saying and I agree with that.

For the record: The Planning Department's write-up for the sign(s) is as follows:

Zoning: C-1, Commercial

Location: Former Lee's Plaza building

Sign #1

Sign Size: 76.6 SF

Sided: ☒ one-sided ☐ Two-sided

Location of Sign: on building facade

Lighted: ☒ Internal ☐ Flood

Sign #2

Sign Size: ~179 SF

Total Height: 13 ft 6 in

Sided: ☐ one-sided ☒ Two-sided

Location of Sign: northside of site entrance driveway

Lighted: ☒ Internal ☐ Flood

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the sign application for Cole's Collision Center contingent on the maximum height of the sign is 12 FT, the "red bands" around the base are backlit to soften the appearance, maximum of 7,000 NITS during the day and 500 NITS during the night regarding intensity of brightness, no message change within a 24-hour period, no animated, flashing or scrolling messages and the sign is not placed in the State right-of-way. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

12.076 NB Anna's Place Residential Subdivision, 95 Werner Road – Major Subdivision

Mr. Roberts recused himself from this item. Mr. Bruce Tanski, the applicant, stated the following: Based on my conversations with some of the Planning Board members and Town Board members and based on the meeting that I was at last week and knowing what the feelings are on duplexes, I hereby withdrawn my application for duplexes on Werner Road. Now I'm going to go with a single-family subdivision. With that, I'm going to turn it over to my engineer, Mr. Scott Lansing. Mr. Scott

Lansing, of Lansing Engineering, stated the following: I'm here tonight for the Anna's Place Residential Subdivision located off of Werner Road. The existing parcel is approximately 19.22-acres and it is zoned Agricultural-Residential (A-R). There is a mobile home park on the northern section, some vacant land to the east, a residential subdivision to the south and also residences towards the west of the project. We are proposing 28 single-family residential units. All the units are proposed to be in accordance with the A-R zoning ordinance. The lots are proposed to be 20,000 SF in size minimum. Each one of the units would have 100 FT of frontage at the building line and a 50 FT front yard setback. Regarding the roadways; we are proposing a connection on Werner Road and approximately 1,984 linear feet of roadway within the project and we are also proposing a connection to the Kelly Lane project, which is located to the south. If you recall, this project did have a temporary turnaround at the end and it was anticipated how this project would extend and go on to the parcel towards the north. There would be public water and currently there is a water main on Kelly Lane and also along Werner Road. We would propose to loop that water through the project. Sanitary sewer would be to the Saratoga County Sewer District (SCSD#1) and currently there is a gravity main on Kelly Lane. We're proposed to go gravity to that main on Kelly Lane. So, the entire project would be served by gravity. Stormwater would be mitigated on-site in accordance with the latest stormwater regulations. We are here tonight for questions and comments from the Board and hopefully a referral to CHA for review. Mr. Nadeau asked what is the distance from the northern exit to the house that is almost right on Werner Road and what is the sight distance? Mr. Lansing stated it is roughly 500 FT. Mr. Higgins asked are there any concerns regarding sight distance? Mr. Lansing stated the following: We did have a traffic study performed by Creighton-Manning and they did look at the access to this site and they identified this as the optimal location for the site access. They did note that the sight distance was very close looking south and they did recommend some clearing of the vegetation along the frontage of the parcel to get the sight distance as close as possible. It did not meet the sight distance requirement but it was not something that they felt would warrant intersection warning signs because it was that close. We do have a copy of that study than we can provide to the Board for their review. Mr. Higgins asked so the sight distance does not meet the minimum requirements? Mr. Lansing stated correct, it is just shy of it. Mr. Higgins stated looking at Lot 19, 20 and 21; is there a reason why you couldn't go out with a driveway for Lot 20 between Lot 13 and Lot 14 and have single driveways for Lot 19 and 21? Mr. Lansing stated we could do that. Mr. Higgins stated we've had a lot of long combined driveways lately and we're just trying to avoid problems. Mr. Lansing stated sure we can do that, that's a good point and that would be a shorter driveway. Mr. Ouimet stated the following: I'm a little confused what Mr. Lansing just said regarding Creighton-Manning has determined that the way that road is laid out, it doesn't meet minimum sight distance? Mr. Lansing stated the following: No, it does not. The location is the optimal for the property and it's just shy and if it is shy, you can provide intersection warning signs, but because it is all that close, they're not recommending a warning sign because it is just so close and they feel that a sign would be more of a distraction than it would be a service to the lack of sight distance. Mr. Higgins asked so the only way to improve that would be to move it north? Mr. Lansing stated I would have to consult with Creighton-Manning regarding that. Mr. Higgins stated but that would infringe on Lot #'s 1, 2 and 3 to move that whole road north. Mr. Lansing stated the following: I'm not sure if it gets any better moving it towards the north. I believe moving it towards the south may increase it if you were to be up on the hill, but again, I apologize because I did not do the traffic study. Mr. Watts asked when you say "just", what's the word "just" mean, 10 FT, 2 FT or 100 FT? Mr. Lansing stated the following: The stopping sight distance northbound; available is 355 and recommended is 360, so that is 5 FT off. The stopping sight distance southbound; available is 395 and recommended is 400, so both of those would be 5 FT off. Mr. Ouimet asked in this particular

parcel, what is the maximum number of single-family homes you could fit in there? Mr. Lansing stated I believe based off the calculations; we came up with 34 and we are proposing 28. Mr. Nadeau asked is there a natural buffering on the northern side where Lot #'s 7, 8, 9 and 10 are located? Mr. Lansing stated the following: Pretty much the whole parcel is wooded for the most part with the exception of a clearing in the front portion of the parcel where the existing home is. So, yes, there is a natural buffer in that area. Mr. Nadeau stated I don't understand, is it not visible? Mr. Lansing stated the only cleared area on the parcel is by the existing residence in the front and the remainder of the parcel does have vegetation on it. So, yes, there is a natural buffer. Mr. Higgins asked are you going to look at a no-cut buffer at the rear of those lots? Mr. Lansing stated it is not something that we have proposed at this time but we can discuss that with the applicant. Mr. Watts stated the following: At this time, we are going to refer this to CHA for review. I would like you to take into consideration the questions that we have asked when you are dealing with CHA. From this purview, the Planning Board raised some good questions relative to the intensity of use of this site before. The applicant has made the changes and we're moving forward from here with a single-family residential project.

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

12.077 NB Hess Corporation, 1513 Crescent-Vischer Ferry Road – Sign

No representative was present for this application; therefore, no action was taken on this item.

12.078 NB Halfmoon Sandwich & Salad Shoppe, 1613 Route 9 – Sign

Mr. Tim Prescott, of Ray Sign, stated the following: I'm here tonight representing the Halfmoon Sandwich & Salad Shoppe. We are proposing to add a freestanding sign to the new location of the business located at 1613 Route 9. For the top section of the sign we are proposing an internally lit box with fluorescent lights with a digital display underneath the sign. The digital display would only be used for text messages. There would not be any scrolling or any images. This sign will not have the red type of LED like the Walgreens sign. The sign would have an amber color monochrome display. The sign has built-in photo eyes so the sign would automatically adjust to take the brightness away at night. The sign would be 7 FT to the top from grade and roughly 33 SF total. Mr. Roberts stated the following: It looks good and Mr. Prescott covered all the basis. The reader board can only change once every 24-hours. Mr. Higgins stated also the sign has to have a maximum of 7,000 NITS during the day and 500 NITS during the night regarding intensity of brightness per the Town's sign ordinance. Mr. Prescott stated the following: I'm sure the sign will comply per the Town's ordinance, but I can get the information. The sign would not be any brighter than Casale's sign. Mr. Roberts stated also make sure the sign is not place in the State right-of-way. Mr. Prescott stated yes, it would be and we are going to leave the existing sign up until the new sign comes in about 6 weeks. Mr. Roberts stated the following: Okay, because we don't want confusion for the customers and if you have two signs up, it's not going to look right. Mr. Prescott stated we might move the existing sign to the new location until the new sign arrives so customers will drive into the right parking lot. Mrs. Murphy stated the following: Just so we are very clear and the applicant is very clear; the old sign has to come down before the new sign is installed. The limit is a maximum of 7,000 NITS during the day and 500 NITS at night. The sign can only change every 24-hours and obviously no rotating, animated, scrolling, etc. on the sign's reader board. Also, it cannot be placed in the State right-of-way.

For the record: The Planning Department's write-up for the sign(s) is as follows:

Location: at the northern end of the property frontage on Route 9

Zoning: C-1, Commercial

Sign Size: 66.5 SF

Total Height: 90"

Sided: ☐ one-sided ☒ **Two-sided**

Lighted: ☒ **Internal** ☐ Flood

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the sign application for the Halfmoon Sandwich & Salad Shoppe contingent on a maximum of 7,000 NITS during the day and 500 NITS during the night regarding intensity of brightness, no message change within a 24-hour period, no animated, flashing or scrolling messages and the sign is not placed in the State right-of-way. Mr. Higgins seconded. Motion carried.

**12.079 NB The Kensington at Halfmoon PDD, 127 Stone Quarry Road – Major
Subdivision/PDD**

Mr. Bill Hoblock, of Capital District Properties, stated the following: Mr. Joe Dannible, of the Environmental Design Partnership, is also here with me tonight. We have submitted our application to establish The Kensington at Halfmoon Planned Development District (PDD). At the last Town Board meeting, they referred this application to the Planning Board for recommendation. I have submitted booklets that have a narrative and all supporting materials that are required by code. The booklet contains an aerial vicinity map, a site plan, the existing conditions map, the elevations and a Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF). The parcel is 17.39-acres located south of Stone Quarry Road just west of Route 9. The surrounding land uses is everything on Stone Quarry Road and the adjacent uses on Stone Quarry Road are all two families. Everything to the east of the property is industrial or commercial. When you get to the south of the site there is an existing commercial industrial park. Across the road is the Hudson Ridge PDD, which is ours. The Hudson Ridge PDD is under construction and that is going to be a top of the market multi-family rental apartment community. In the approval process for the Hudson Ridge PDD, we told the Town Board and the Planning Board that we were building something in Saratoga Springs called the Paddock's that the Hudson Ridge PDD will be just like. At that time the Paddock's hadn't been built yet so there was nothing for the Board's to see so the Board's took us on what we said we were going to do. You no longer have to listen to what I say we are going to do because now you can look at what we have done. So, if you haven't been up to the Paddock's, please do. You can contact me and I can arrange for anyone to see it because that is what is coming here and that is what we are proposing here with The Kensington at Halfmoon PDD. The overall picture is that we are the Hudson Ridge PDD and we're branding The Kensington at Halfmoon PDD. We are proposing this PDD as a seamless continuation of that and that is why we are calling this PDD application The Kensington of Halfmoon PDD. The history of the property; back in 2006 this Board approved the same exact 17.39-acres for a 10 lot single-family home subdivision so the property is zoned Residential (R-1). That project has since been abandoned and obviously never built as the land currently sits vacant. We purchased this property about 4 years ago. The timing of this PDD application really coincides with the construction of the Hudson Ridge PDD. I didn't want to bring forth this application until we were going vertical across the street at Hudson Ridge. We did the majority of the site work on our own through the end of last year. We paused and we will be going vertical across the road in the next 30 to 45 days. Once I have that schedule set and we're ready to go, it is now time to bring the Kensington of Halfmoon PDD to the Board's. I just didn't want this application to be premature. Exhibit #2 in the booklet shows 9 residential buildings that will all be the same. They all will have 10 residences per building for a total of 90 luxury apartments. In each 10-unit building, there are 8 in-building direct access garages and that would leave 2

residences in each building without a garage. So you would have a 2 bay garage right next to the building for those 2 apartments that don't have the direct access garages. We paid particular attention to coverage and density. The buildings themselves cover less than 2-acres of the site, which is 10%. When you add roads, parking and driveways; that is another 11%. So 75% of this site is going to be green, untouched or reclaimed. Density; the code permits a residential PDD 10-units per gross acre for the 17.39-acres. So under the code we could ask for 174 dwelling units and we are asking for 90, which is 5-units per gross acres, which is a little bit under Hudson Ridge that was approved at a little bit over 6 but it would be very similar. The overall site elements are going to remain street trees, Old English street lamps and sidewalks and again, the majority of the site would remain green and untouched. This is the same building that would be across the road in the Hudson Ridge PDD. If you look at our previous jobs, you will see that these buildings are the highest level of rental communities that you can build in this market, bar none. Each residence has spacious floor plans, designer kitchens with granite, pendant lighting, real wood cabinets, wood floors and tile throughout. These are the same things that I told this Board and the Town Board in the past in what we were doing across the street and this is the same thing that you are going to see here and the same thing that we built up in Saratoga. It's really designed like something you would buy within a rental setting. The amenities associated with this PDD are going to be a seamless continuation of what is across the road. There will be a clubhouse that has a state-of-the-art fitness center, a private movie theatre room, a billiards room, a yoga-pilates studio, and a resort style pool. All of those amenities would be complimentary to the residents. The people that we are going to see living here are the same kind of people living up in Saratoga at the Paddock's. We would see a lot of empty nesters, people who are downsizing who want nothing to do with a home anymore and who would never live in an older apartment or inferior apartment and who want something new and state-of-the art. We also would have a lot of people who would be living there only during the warm months and would go to a warmer climate during the winter. We would see a lot of young professionals; married, unmarried and people who don't have children yet. We also would see a tremendous amount of relocations coming into the area whether it's Global Foundries or the Nano College. We are on the frontlines and we see people coming in from all over the country and the world who are demanding the highest end rental product in this area and that's what we're providing. Utilities; we're bringing water in from Hudson Ridge. We're bringing water in from Route 9 along Stone Quarry Road and we are actually looping it all the way down to Woodin Road. So, there would be water right at the site of the proposed PDD. Sewer; There is the Birchwood pump station in connection with the Hudson Ridge PDD and that would come down to Stone Quarry Road. So, you would have sewer right across the road from this site. Stormwater management; everything is going to be on-site in detention and retention basins and as the engineering process advances, that will all be presented to CHA and designed in accordance with standards. Public benefit; one of the most important things associated with a PDD is a completely discretionary application and something that in the past we've worked the Town Board to bring forward benefits for the entire Town of Halfmoon or the area around the proposed project is very important and we understand that and we are going to work hard on it. The public benefits associated with Hudson Ridge, while they're different and not applicable to this PDD application, I would like to run through those. We are doing two traffic improvements at the intersection of Stone Quarry Road and Woodin Road. We are completely redesigning that so that problem area is taken care of. The other traffic improvement is Stone Quarry Road and Route 9 that have two problems that were taken care of in connection with Hudson Ridge. The vertical realignment; where we are taking down the hump on Stone Quarry Road, and we are also adding a right turn lane to Stone Quarry Road as you approach Route 9. So, they are very significant improvements. Sanitary sewer improvements; where the current line goes into the Grooms Road/Guideboard Road

there is a capacity issue. So, off-site, we are pulling that line out and plugging it into the county truck main, which is up there to alleviate those capacity issues and we are completely rebuilding the Birchwood pump station where we would be building a new pump station next to the existing pump station. Another element of public benefit that we can do in this area that we are already doing is that we have provided sanitary sewer service down to Vandenburg Park and in order to do that we ran a 2-inch force sewer main all the way up Woodin Road to the Ponderosa Station and provided tap-ins to everybody along the road. So, not only did we provide service to people who wanted it on Woodin Road who didn't have it and there were a lot of septic issues because of the topography in the soil, we're also eliminating some issues down at Vandenburg Park. Mr. Roberts stated but these improvements have nothing to do with this application. Mr. Hoblock stated the following: Right. The only reason I mentioned them is because whenever I was talking public benefits, the first question was "well you have sewer issues here" and "you've got road issues here", so I'm kind of putting them out of the way so you know. The discussions that we're going to have to have with the Town are what are the public benefits that a job can bear and that also benefit the Town. So, I'm bringing everybody up to speed on what's being done across the street so you know and these have already been taken care. Lastly is the water infrastructure and we are looping the waterline all the way from Route 9 all the way down Stone Quarry Road and we're also providing tap-ins along the entire road for everybody. If you look at that, we're taking care of a lot of the potential public benefits associated with that area. As we started discussions with Town, we've started to look at other parts of the Town because everything has basically been taken care of here for the most part. We know that there are some Plank Road water issues that we started to have discussions about and potentially some improvements to the Town's recreational fields in other parts of Town because we have already handled so much here. Why is this an appropriate land use for this parcel? If you look at the Town Comprehensive Plan, this parcel is what's in the core area under the Town Comp. Plan. The core area, as evidenced by name, is targeted for development given its location to the central part of Town to Route 9, which is the spine of the Town. In addition, the Comp. Plan also cites future multi-family development along the Route 9 corridor. In reality when you start to look at the aerial maps, you see that this becomes an infill piece. This is far from a cornfield or something on the outside of Town. This is really in the middle of Town and the core of Town. The surrounding land uses also makes multi-family a very appropriate and highest and best use for this piece. As I mentioned before, all of the existing adjacent residential on Stone Quarry Road is already multi-family and all of the other surrounding land uses is C-1 so it's going to be commercial and industrial as I went through in the beginning. What this piece becomes from a planning perspective when you look at it, is your traditional transition piece. You're going from your retail, your commercial and your industrial and your transitioning through a multi-family and kind of getting into housing into your single-family housing. When you look at appropriate planning, that's where you want multi-family housing. You want it transitioning and that's really a true transition piece. It's also appropriate given what's going on across the road, acting as a seamless continuation of it. It's an absolution for a pretty awkward piece of property. Single-family homes didn't work there and that project was abandoned. You have your surrounding uses that also make single-family homes pretty difficult to do as evidenced by the prior abandonment of the project. So, when you look at it from a planning perspective, it's really a quality top-of-the-market multi-family community, you're acting as a continuation of what's going on across the road it becomes the obvious solution and the best and highest use for the property. Mr. Higgins asked what is the site like, is there a lot of wetlands or is it all uphill? Mr. Hoblock stated the following: Along the border you have just a small stream with a couple of small fingers that come up that core. Besides that, once you get up, it's high and dry and there is nothing up top. It's like that whole area is rock and it's difficult to develop, which is another reason

not to try to put 10 homes in there with the kind of site work that they would have to do and most likely that was one of the reasons that that never happened. Mr. Higgins stated the following: Plus I think at that point they were looking at the fact that you guys weren't in yet so they were still looking at the water and sewer that they were going to have to extend and everything else. So, that's one of the things that might of made single-families a little less attractive. Mr. Hoblock stated they knew it was coming and we had discussions with them and they knew we were bringing it to the site but you're right, they didn't know the schedule. Mr. Higgins asked what is your schedule across the road? Mr. Hoblock stated the following: The schedule is that the majority of the site is done and half of the site is completely shovel ready and foundation ready. Infrastructure is in, the sewer lines are in, the waterlines are in, stormwater management is in, the sub-base is in, the final grading is done and the foundations are ready to go. So, we are going to be restarting that portion of the site in 30 to 45 days with foundations going in immediately and buildings going up immediately. As we do that, we'll finish the remainder of the site work on this part of the site so when that is done it just rolls through in one continuous phase. Mr. Higgins stated you have to get all your off-site work done before the Certificate of Occupancies (C.O.'s). Mr. Hoblock stated the following: Yes. One area is done and you can do your sewer and water lines during the winter. The two things that we are going to have to wait until spring to do mostly likely would be the two traffic improvement because you're already into September and they're massive improvements and given the scheduling of them, you would run into some problems with the asphalt. Mr. Higgins stated so you're not looking for any C.O.'s for that until mid-summer next year. Mr. Hoblock stated the following: Yes because it's about an 8 month build by the time we start our first building. So, it would be about 8.5-9 months maybe. So, if you started it in 45 days, you're already into the end of October, early November so you're in the springtime or summertime. So, if you leave the only outstanding off-site improvements with this to be these two traffic improvements, the schedule works and everything else you can do during the winter. Mr. Berkowitz asked how many of the 17 acres are actually buildable because there are steep slopes in the back, right? Mr. Hoblock stated yes there are. Mr. Dannible stated I would have to get that calculation for you but a good portion of the land is wetlands and slopes shown on the map. Mr. Berkowitz stated on the map it looks like it is pretty steep. Mr. Hoblock stated yes it is, in the back. Mr. Berkowitz asked has Creighton-Manning looked at new traffic studies based on another 150 cars on that road. Mr. Hoblock stated they are doing that as we speak. Mr. Berkowitz stated because even with the new traffic improvements at the intersections; are some of those intersections still going to be a failure? Mr. Hoblock stated I don't know because they are doing the study now. Mr. Berkowitz stated if there is a situation on the Northway, no one is getting out of the road and the current Northway construction on the bridge is going to go on every weekend for the next two months. Mr. Hoblock stated I know, that was a disaster but the study is underway. Mr. Nadeau asked Mr. Bianchino if all the infrastructure has been completed? Mr. Bianchino stated I think Mr. Hoblock said the sewer line up to Ponderosa is in. Mr. Hoblock stated yes. Mr. Bianchino stated I don't believe the waterline is in. Mr. Hoblock stated the following: No. In connection with the on-site work, the only off-site that we did was the Woodin Road sewer line to get that one out of the way. So, that leaves the waterline and the sewer. Mr. Ouimet asked did you say the on-site work has been done? Mr. Hoblock stated a majority of it, not all of it, but a lot of it. Mr. Ouimet asked Mr. Bianchino if he had an opportunity to review the on-site work that was done. Mr. Bianchino stated no. Mr. Hoblock stated not the on-site work but CHA did all the off-site work and obviously we pulled all our permits and everything has been submitted to the Town. There were no on-site inspections required yet. Mr. Ouimet asked when you first submitted the original Hudson Ridge PDD didn't you request 300 units? Mr. Hoblock stated yes we did. Mr. Ouimet asked didn't this Board have a question about density with the 300 units? Mr. Hoblock

stated yes, you did. Mr. Ouimet asked and didn't you agree to lower the density to 200 units? Mr. Hoblock stated we did. Mr. Ouimet stated the following: Now you want to bring back 90 more units. Now you want to bring it all up with the two projects to be close 300 units on Stone Quarry Road. Mr. Hoblock stated that is correct. Mr. Ouimet stated and you don't want to make any more traffic improvements? Mr. Hoblock stated no, I never said that. Mr. Ouimet stated you're not proposing any more traffic improvements. Mr. Hoblock stated the following: The traffic study is not done. Until I see the traffic study, I'm not going to play a traffic engineer. When we have the traffic study and whatever work needs to be done, needs to be done. I just don't know what traffic work needs to be done yet until the traffic study is done. Mr. Ouimet stated my question to you would be if we wouldn't entertain 300 units in your original project proposal, what makes you think we're going to entertain 290 units now? Mr. Hoblock stated well that was 300 units on 32-acres and now you've picked up almost an additional 18-acres. Mr. Ouimet stated but you haven't changed the road that you're going to put the cars out on. Mr. Hoblock stated the following: But it will because in the spring this is all going to be changed. All those traffic improvements are going to be done and that was one of the biggest issues. Mr. Ouimet stated okay, so you're just hoping that Creighton-Manning's study comes in and says that the traffic generated by the additional 90 units will not degrade the two intersection improvements that you already agreed to. Mr. Hoblock stated I'm sorry but I don't know that yet. Mr. Ouimet stated the following: But you're hoping that, right? Why else would you propose the project? Mr. Hoblock stated the following: I haven't seen the report yet and when I see the report, we can then discuss what the findings are. But until we see their findings, I don't know what to discuss. Personally, I have no idea, I'm not a traffic engineer and I don't know what an "A", an "E", a "D" and an "F" and that's why we hired Creighton-Manning and that study is now underway. Mr. Ouimet stated the following: Logic would say to me that even with the proposed traffic intersection improvements that you already agreed to do for Hudson Ridge project, which is 200 units. If it had worked with 300 units, we would have given you the 300 units, don't you think? Mr. Hoblock stated the following: I don't believe the decrease in density was just traffic driven. That was a long time ago and that goes back to 2005 or 2006. So, I just don't know that. As I recall, I don't think that decrease in density was strictly traffic driven. I'm sure it was a consideration but I don't recall it being solely but again, that was a long time ago. Mr. Ouimet stated the following: Traffic notwithstanding at this point. Let's talk about how you're going to get the people from the proposed Kensington project over to use the infrastructure you're putting in at Hudson Ridge. How are they going to get there? Mr. Hoblock stated most likely, they would drive there. Mr. Ouimet asked do you have additional parking spaces sufficient for 90 units worth of cars? Mr. Hoblock stated the following: Yes, it will be planned for it. The only cross-pollination would be a clubhouse. Otherwise, this stands on its own and there's nothing else you would have to go across the street for. Mr. Ouimet asked have you looked at more than one entrance and exit to your proposal? Mr. Hoblock stated no, not yet but I'm sure Creighton-Manning will. Mr. Ouimet stated the following: I would encourage you to look at it now as opposed to going too far down the road. I'd also encourage you to look at additional traffic improvements on Stone Quarry Road. Mr. Hoblock stated okay, fair enough. Mr. Ouimet stated I think that you're replacing a 10-unit conventional subdivision with a 90-unit apartment building and you'll be adding a lot of cars to a country road. Mr. Nadeau stated the following: I agree with Mr. Ouimet on that entrance whether Creighton-Manning says it does not need it or not. I would assume that we would want to see a second entrance on that project. That's a lot of apartments in there, for whatever reason, to block that road off and not be able to get in there. So you would need to look at that. Mr. Hoblock stated okay. Mr. Nadeau stated the following: Initially you said 25% of the site is the apartment complex and you said 75% was remaining open space. Basically, that 75% is not buildable, is that correct? Mr. Hoblock stated some of it, correct.

Mr. Berkowitz asked is all the site work done at Hudson Ridge as far as blasting. Mr. Hoblock stated the following: Not all of it but most of it until you get down to the fine grade work. I'm going to say probably 75%, if not 80% or 85% of the masonry work is done. Mr. Berkowitz stated you had a lot more problems than you thought you would with the blasting at that site. Mr. Hoblock stated no, it's exactly what we thought it was because it's Stone Quarry Road. Mr. Berkowitz stated I know we got a lot of complaints with rocks in peoples yards and cracks in buildings. Mr. Hoblock stated the following: Whatever issues we had, we handled that day. If there were more that I never saw, then I wished I did because as anyone in the Town knows, I respond the same day I get an issue. I may have had 4 complaints but it certainly wasn't a slew. We had a pre-blast plan and all the neighbors knew about it. I didn't think it was an issue. Mr. Berkowitz stated the following: I saw at least two letters with complaints but I don't know how they were resolved. The only reason why I'm asking is because is the same thing going to happen at this site? Mr. Hoblock stated the following: You will have blasting here. The good news is here you have homes and here you have an industrial park. Mr. Berkowitz stated well you still have homes on Stone Quarry Road. Mr. Hoblock stated the following: Here the blasting was pretty far back. You still will have blasting and absolutely you will have some multi-families and duplexes across the road, which are residential. But the vast majority of what's around you is not residential; it's commercial, industrial or vacant. Mr. Watts stated the following: The point I want to make relative to blasting is; the people who are doing the blasting are business people and they are in it to make money. Any time we've had blasting anywhere in Town, we've had issues. Some are issues where people are just kind of disturbed and it's really not major. But we've had them in many places. I can personally attest to the blasting at this site where a mistake was made where the guy did do a little too much and I thought a plane crashed not too far from my backyard. So, there were issues with the blasting. So, if and when we go forward with this and there is any blasting, please keep track of the people who are doing it. If they can get a good blast done in a quicker time, some of them are going to do it. I know the Town tries to keep track of it but people are not used to having that and I understand that it goes on. I'm not going to make light of the fact that it occurred. So, please keep track of it. Mr. Hoblock stated the following: I'm not making light of it. All I'm saying is that whenever there was an issue, we try to be as responsive as possible. Mr. Watts stated the following: I know but what I'm saying is going forward based upon some of the issues we had there, I think there was just enough whether it was the company who was doing it or whatever. We have different companies that come into Town and do work. If and when we have our pre-construction meetings we'll be very careful about the hours of operation and anything else that goes on at the site, as you would do with any other site. So, keep track of it. Mr. Hoblock stated I hear you guys loud and clear. Mr. Watts stated I would urge you to get Creighton-Manning moving. Mr. Hoblock stated the following: Certainly I wouldn't come back here until that is done because I don't think that would make any sense. While CHA is doing their review, we'll get that report out as soon as we can so they have the complete package when it's time to review. Mr. Watts stated correct and make sure you let Creighton-Manning know the questions that the Planning Board raised relative to traffic in both places so they can make it part of their review. Mr. Hoblock stated I will.

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

12.081 NB Andrea's Pub, 1436 Vischer Ferry Road – Sign

Mr. Patrick Pagano stated the following: I'm a Clifton Park resident and my wife Tracey is here with me tonight. We own the property at Andrea's Pub located at 1436 Vischer Ferry Road at the end of Stone Quarry Road. We currently have a sign that is in very bad shape; it's falling down and

its 20 years old. The sign is made out of plywood and is covered with vinyl and it is falling apart. We are looking to replace the existing dilapidated sign with a new sign that will state "Andrea's Pub" "Est. 1984". The proposed sign is the same size as the one that is being replaced. The lighting would remain the same. Mr. Roberts asked what is the total height of the sign? Mr. Williams stated the sign itself is 7 FT with 10 FT support columns.

For the record: The Planning Department's write-up for the sign(s) is as follows:

Zoning: PO/R

Sign Size: 4 ft x 4ft = 16 SF

Height of Sign: 7ft with 10ft support columns

Sided: ☐ one-sided ☒ **Two-sided**

Location of Sign: in front of site

Lighted: ☐ Internal ☒ **Flood**

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the sign application for Andrea's Pub. Mr. Berkowitz seconded. Motion carried.

12.083 NB Zach Stone Barber, 222 Guideboard Road (222 Plaza) – Change of Tenant

No representative was present for this application; therefore, no action was taken on this item.

Mr. Nadeau made a motion to adjourn the September 10, 2012 Planning Board meeting at 8:07 pm. Mr. Higgins seconded. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
Milly Pascuzzi
Planning Board Secretary