

Town of Halfmoon Planning Board

Meeting Minutes – February 27, 2012

Those present at the February 27, 2012 Planning Board meeting were:

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

Senior Planner: Jeff Williams
Planner: Lindsay Zepko

Town Attorney: Lyn Murphy

Town Board Liaisons: Paul Hotaling
Walt Polak

CHA Representative: Mike Bianchino

Mr. Watts opened the February 27, 2012 Planning Board Meeting at 7:00 pm. Mr. Watts asked the Planning Board Members if they had reviewed the February 13, 2012 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the February 13, 2012 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried. Mr. Higgins abstained due to his absence from the February 13, 2012 Planning Board meeting.

Public Hearing:

12.013 PH Fairway Meadows Phase III, Dormie Ave. & Timothys Way – Major Subdivision

Mr. Roberts recused himself from this item. Mr. Watts opened the Public Hearing at 7:01 pm. Mr. Watts asked if anyone would like to have the public notice read. No one responded. Mr. Scott Lansing, of Lansing Engineering, stated the following: We are here tonight for Fairway Meadows Phase III. I believe the Board is somewhat familiar with this project. The overall parcel is approximately 260-acres near Johnson Road and Staniak Road. The first phase was approximately 75-units, the second phase was approximately 101-units. The third and final phase of this 260-acre parcel would be 62-units for a total of 238-units. Back in 2003 the project was reviewed to be in accordance with the Northern Halfmoon Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) and a Negative Declaration (NEG DEC) was issued for the overall project and this is in conformance with the original layout and approved NEG DEC that was provided for the project. I would like to note that the original NEG DEC was issued based on 258-units. So, we are less than that and we are at 238-units overall right now. As the various phases were developed, the number of units did reduce. It is a conventional subdivision and all the lots within the subdivision are proposed to meet

the Agricultural-Residential (A-R) zoning which is a 20,000 SF minimum lot size, 100 FT frontage, 50 FT front yard setback, 30 FT rear yard setback and a 10 FT side yard setback. We have provided greenspace in accordance with the Northern Halfmoon GEIS with 20 percent provided along Johnson Road and Staniak Road and there is additional greenspace within the project. The original project did have a trail system throughout with an internal neighborhood network of trails. This third and final phase does not include any sort of trail systems as outlined in the original approvals but it is my understanding that Saratoga County is looking for a route for the Zim Smith Trail and the applicant has been coordinating with the County and is prepared to continue to coordinate with the County on whatever their needs might be. Water for the project would be provided by an existing watermain in Phase II of the project extending through and servicing all the units with public water for both domestic use and fire flow use. Regarding sanitary sewer, there is a portion that does go gravity and the remainder of the units would be on grinder pumps and that eventually all goes down to a trunk line in the northeastern portion of the project, which goes to a trunk line along the railroad tracks. Stormwater would be managed on-site through a stormwater basin located in the northern section and then an existing basin located in the Phase II area of the project. Again, this is a conventional subdivision and we are here tonight for a public hearing. Mr. Watts asked if anyone from the public wished to speak. Mr. Edmund Rucinski stated the following: I live at 73 Staniak Road. My family has property to the west of this particular parcel. When I received the public hearing notice of this pending Board meeting, I came to look at the plans and while I was in the Town lobby, I noticed the 1866 map of Halfmoon. That 1866 map indicates the old Callahan Farm that my grandparents purchased as extending a little further to the east that is indicated on the present tax map. I checked through the old deeds that are located in the County and there was no transfer of property based on the legal descriptions in the deeds that have come down since the Fenn's owned the place back in the 1840's. I'm just wondering what the discrepancy could be caused by. There are 3 houses built along the boundary indicated in the old 1866 map and according to aerial photographs there is a very ancient fence line that does seem to coincide with the boundary. So, I'm not sure who actually has title to that strip of land and if there is any way of resolving this. Mrs. Murphy asked Mr. Lansing if he had it surveyed. Mr. Lansing stated yes we did. Mrs. Murphy asked what did your survey show? Mr. Lansing stated the survey shows the boundaries that we are depicting on the plans and it was done by a licensed surveyor. Mrs. Murphy asked Mr. Rucinski if he had it surveyed by a licensed surveyor. Mr. Rucinski stated I will have to have that done now. Mrs. Murphy stated the following: Unfortunately that's the only way and what will happen is that most professional surveyors will work with one another because obviously they do it out of pins and different landmarks that exist in the topography today and the two surveyors will hopefully agree and if they don't agree, then it becomes a civil issue as to who owns the property. Unfortunately, a map like that isn't something that this Board would be able to enforce. Frankly, even with a surveyors map, it becomes a civil issue as to who owns what. It would be a property dispute. Unfortunately, the Planning Board does have any jurisdiction to make a determination with regards to that type of dispute. Thank you for bringing that to their concern. Mr. Watts closed the Public Hearing at 7:06 pm. Mr. Watts stated the following: We received a letter from Mr. Jason Kemper, Director of Planning at Saratoga County, relative to the Zim Smith trail that is trying to be worked out at this point. I will read Mr. Kemper's letter and enter it into the record.

(See attachment – page 3)

Jeff Williams - Zim Smith Trail in the Town of Halfmoon

From: Jason Kemper <jkemper@saratogacountyny.gov>
To: Jeff Williams <jwilliams@townofhalfmoon.org>
Date: 2/27/2012 3:50 PM
Subject: Zim Smith Trail in the Town of Halfmoon
CC: "Chris Cornwall (ccornwell@gpinet.com)" <ccornwell@gpinet.com>, "Sean M...."

Jeff,

Per our previous discussions, Saratoga County has explored different options in extending the Zim Smith trail on the south side of the railroad tracks to the City of Mechanicville. Option A consisted of construction of a long span 225' truss bridge. This option was eliminated due to costs in excess of \$750,000. The second option involved the construction of a trail skirting the ridge break on the ravine. This option would construct the trail on the backside of the proposed subdivision lots and would add approximately 2200 feet of additional asphalt trail to the project. Discussions with Bruce Tanski were not favorable as this would cut down on property values of the proposed lot subdivision. The recent third option was the use of the proposed subdivision roads to serve as a shared bike lane and then construction of a 8' paved asphalt sidewalk with a 5' grass utility strip which would accommodate pedestrians. This third option provides for the most cost effective construction of the trail through the rear of the Tanski subdivision. Mr. Tanski has been very accommodating to the requests made by Saratoga County to accommodate the Zim Smith Trail in the future. If the proposal moves forward with using the ROW in the subdivision this would represent a significant savings to Saratoga County as well as giving the residents of this and surrounding subdivisions direct access to a county-wide trail.

I would like to emphasize that the exact details of this alignment have not been worked out but I would request that the Town of Halfmoon keep this option open as you move forward with approval of this project. Saratoga County appreciates the efforts made by Mr. Tanski and the Town of Halfmoon in helping us complete the Zim Smith Trail.

Feel free to contact me with any questions.

Jason Kemper
Director of Planning, Saratoga County
50 West High Street
Ballston Spa, NY 12020
(518) 884-4705
(518) 884-4780 (fax)
jkemper@saratogacountyny.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

This transmission, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) or entity named above and may contain confidential and privileged information. If you received this and are not the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, unauthorized distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately contact the sender as indicated above to arrange the proper handling of the information.

I wanted to get this letter into the record that this is being worked on. You really aren't showing any details here at this point. Mr. Lansing stated correct, not at this point. Mr. Watts stated it would be our intention to hold a public informational meeting when this is worked out so people would be made aware of the implications of a trail on their particular property because some people will love it and some won't. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Bianchino if he had anything to add to this at this point. Mr. Bianchino stated the following: Other than what Mr. Watts has stated, it is Mr. Kemper's intent to try and connect the ends of the Zim Smith and the ultimate goal is get it from where it ends now in Mechanicville. We do have an offer of a piece of property from the railroad so Mr. Kemper is just trying to close that gap. Mr. Higgins stated the following: In the Planning Board topics there was a discussion about the water line extension along Staniak Road, Johnson Road and into the development. At this point it doesn't appear that there is any kind of a time schedule as far as when that work would be completed and it also has to do with some road work that has to be done on Johnson Road. Mrs. Murphy stated the following: With the water district extension agreement, which they'll have to sign after they get preliminary approval and we put that together, part of that is that they have to bond for those improvements or they can't go forward and get water service to that property. So, we do have the safeguard in there in the extension agreement itself. Mr. Higgins stated okay, I just wanted that for the record. Mr. Berkowitz asked Mr. Lansing to point out on the map where the County trail and internal trail would be for each proposal. Mr. Lansing showed the Board where the internal trail was located and stated it does not go through Phase III of this project. Mr. Lansing also showed the Board where the potential County trail would be located and stated there have been alignment discussions. Mr. Berkowitz asked do you know how much use the internal trail has at this time? Mr. Tanski, the applicant, stated there are no internal trails at this time. Mr. Berkowitz stated okay, so nothing has been built yet. Mr. Tanski stated right.

Mr. Ouimet made a motion to grant preliminary approval for the major subdivision application for Fairway Meadows Phase III for the applicant to gain review from the NYSDEC, NYSDOH and SCSD#1. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

New Business:

12.016 NB Country Drive-In, 1455 Vischer Ferry Road – Sign

Ms. Lena Riberdy, of Country Drive-In, stated the following: I'm here tonight representing Country Drive-In. We are proposing to just change the panels in our existing sign. Nothing would change and the structure would completely be the same. We are just replacing the panels with new ones and there would be no neon.

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

Zoning: PO/R Professional Office/Residential

Existing Parcel Size: 0.514-acres

Existing Building: ~930 SF

Sign Size: 78 SF (39 SF/side)

Sign Dimensions: 6 ft x 6.5 ft

Total Height:

Sided: ☐ one-sided ☒ Two-sided

Location of Sign: free-standing

Lighted: ☒ Internal ☐ Flood

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the sign application for the Country Drive-In. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

12.017 NB Lana's Beauty Boutique, 1471 Route 9 (Crescent Commons) – Change of Tenant

Mrs. Murphy recused herself from this item. Ms. Lana Scolamiero, the applicant, stated the following: I have been a hairstylist for 42 years and have worked in Clifton Park for 38 of my 42 years in business. I've worked as an independent hairstylist since 1993. I now wish to open my own business at Crescent Commons located at 1471 Route 9, which is owned by MRK Real Property. I'm going to abide by the State of New York and my business is going to be called Lana's Beauty Boutique. My hours of operation will be Monday through Friday from 10:00 am to 5:00 pm and also some Saturdays. Mr. Watts asked would you be the only employee? Ms. Scolamiero stated yes, just me. Mr. Watts asked Ms. Zepko if there was adequate parking at the site. Ms. Zepko stated yes. Mr. Roberts asked do you plan on having a sign in the future? Ms. Scolamiero stated no, just a sign inside and I will be advertising. Mr. Roberts asked do you plan on having any signage on the pylon sign near the road. Ms. Scolamiero stated I don't think I can. Mr. Williams stated Ms. Scolamiero would be located on the second floor and the tenants on the second floor only have interior signage. Mr. Watts stated please advertise that you are located in the Town of Halfmoon. Ms. Scolamiero stated okay, I will.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the change of tenant application for Lana's Beauty Boutique. Mr. Berkowitz seconded. Motion carried.

12.018 NB Fronczek Subdivision, 60 & 66 Ushers Road – Lot Line Adjustment

Mr. Stanley Fronczek, the applicant, stated the following: I'm proposing a simple property line adjustment. One of the parcels belongs to Ushers Road Properties or Mr. Darin DiNello. Our proposal is to extend the boundary line 100 FT to a straight line back to a point on the southwest boundary. It is a pie-shaped piece and it's a ½-acre of land. Mr. Higgins asked was this the site where they were advertising winter storage of RV's, boats and things like that? Mr. Fronczek stated I believe there was a plywood sign there. Mr. Higgins stated the following: That was not part of the original approval for that site and I don't know if this is the appropriate time to bring it up, but if the applicant wants to change the use on that site, he has to come back before this Board. Mr. Fronczek stated I don't know anything about that. Mr. Higgins stated yes, but it is now before the Board changing the lines and that's why I brought it up. Mr. Watts asked are they storing RV's on that site? Mr. Fronczek stated there are none there now. Mr. Higgins stated he was advertising it in the fall and I thought I brought it to Mr. Williams' attention. Mr. Fronczek stated I don't believe the sign is there now. Mr. Higgins stated I don't travel that road all the time so I don't really know if the sign is still there and that's the reason why I brought it up. Mr. Watts stated we will have Code Enforcement go over there to take a look.

Mr. Berkowitz made a motion to set a public hearing for the March 12, 2012 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried.

12.019 NB The Home Depot (Seasonal Sales), 4 Halfmoon Crossing Blvd. – Change of Use

Mr. John Gray, Store Manager at the Halfmoon Home Depot, stated the following: I'm here tonight to ask for our permit for outdoor seasonal storage. Nothing is going to change and it would be the same as it has been for the last few years. We would have extra mulch and soils in designated

areas, which are on our site plan. I brought a picture to show the Board from our last year's outdoor seasonal storage. Mr. Watts stated the reason why we do these outdoor seasonal sales approvals annually is to make sure that the sites are kept in compliance and that the site has been visited by our Code Enforcement staff.

Mr. Ruchlicki made a motion to approve the change of use application for The Home Depot (Seasonal Sales) beginning April 1, 2012 through September 30, 2012. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

12.020 NB AAA Car Care Center, 1647 Route 9 – Sign

Mr. Fred Early, of Signworks Neon Corp., stated the following: Mr. Eric Stigberg, of AAA Northway, is also here with me tonight. You probably have driven by the AAA site and have seen some of the problems with the existing monument sign that was previously approved. The AAA site was done by an architect in Virginia and the base for the sign was built by the general contractor so we just put the sign on top of the base that was provided. Unfortunately, the architect apparently never saw the site or the complexities of the road grade, the turn, and where the sign would actually be located. I think Mr. Stigberg can address some of the problems that they've been having since AAA has opened. Mr. Stigberg stated the following: Obviously the facility is quite visible from the road but with the sign being so low, it is practically invisible. What we have been hearing from people is that they see our building and see what goes on there but they're not realizing that AAA is associated with the auto repair. Auto repair is something that's fairly new to the AAA world. What we are trying to do is to bring attention to the fact that this is a repair facility and anyone can bring their vehicle in to have service done. Mr. Early stated the following: In trying to solve this situation for AAA, we did a number of drive-bys and looked at the sight situation for the sign. Mr. Stigberg and Mr. Phelps informed me that they wanted some additional signs on the building that would say "New York State Inspections" and basic information because people really don't know what goes on at this facility. I looked at the building and I sent them some drawings and I basically told them that nothing they put on the building is going to work because the building is located on a curve, it's hard to see and your vision time is very limited. The best thing that we could suggest was to get the small reader board, which would be closer to the road and it would give people some opportunity to see these messages. These are the messages that they wanted on the building signs: "Members and Nonmembers Welcome" because you don't have to be a member of AAA to use their services. "Alignments", "Oil Changes" and "New York State Inspections" are also available and this would give them the opportunity to get a message up and they could also rotate the messages on the board so at least one message in a short viewing could be read. That would give them that opportunity because the general public doesn't really recognize this as being what this facility is to be used for and that is important to their business. I know there is an issue about the height of the proposed pylon sign now, but in this particular case, once you park a vehicle or a large SUV type vehicle along side where the sign is to be located, you cannot see the sign. If we are not able to elevate the sign, the reader board is gone, it's ineffective and then we're back to square one with an ineffective sign. So we're not only trying to get the AAA logo raised up where people can see it, we are also really trying hard to get this building to be sighted and known for what this business does. This AAA building has a function and the general public doesn't realize the services that the AAA has to offer yet and that's why the business has been suffering. So, we're trying to give them a totally new image at this location from both directions. Where we are placing the sign now is the best spot because they are located on the curve, there are telephone poles and other obstructions visually as you come from both directions. This is the one location where you can kind of get a clear view of the sign and have a chance to

read the sign's messages. So, for that reason we ask you not to fight with the height of this sign at this point. I know you would like to get the height of the sign reduced but you would lose the whole effectiveness of having this sign here. If I dropped it to 12 FT, that would be comfortable as far as the Board is concerned but it would be blocked by parked vehicles. That's really a needed piece of business for this particular operation. Mr. Ouimet asked how many reading panels are you going to have on that sign? Mr. Early stated just 3 FT on each side. Mr. Ouimet asked what are the two panels underneath? Mr. Early stated the following: That is just aluminum cladding over the poles to keep the consistency with somewhat how the sign had looked at the other location. We had the reveal and we're just keeping the reveals in there and we're trying to get a more attractive look to the overall sign instead of having open poles there. Mr. Ouimet asked is the reader board mechanical or digital? Mr. Early stated the following: It would be mechanical. We didn't want to have another digital sign like the sign next door because I think it is very distracting and rather than to double up with a digital sign we wanted to use something a little more basic. It's effective and since the reading time is so short, I suggested to Mr. Stigberg that they keep the messages short and sweet and to keep them changed so that people pay attention to the sign and that is how these signs operate at the best. Mr. Berkowitz asked how often would the reader board be changed. Mr. Early stated it wouldn't be changed everyday. Mr. Berkowitz asked how would the sign be lit? Mr. Early stated the following: The sign would be internally lit but it would be with the LED's and there wouldn't be any spotlight. It would just have the logo lighting as it is and this is the sign from the other location and we're just going to move that portion over and set it back on the new pole structure. Only the logo would light at night and the reader board lighting and that's it. We are trying to keep the amount of lighting to a minimum. Mr. Roberts stated the following: I have a concern and as Mr. Early had mentioned, we do try to keep the height of the signs down. I think you can serve the same goal if he puts in a 12 FT sign by itself because even in the photos there are cars around the sign and there is a SUV parked there in the photo and it's not really blocking the bottom part of the sign at all. In my opinion I really think you can accomplish the same goal with a 12 FT sign rather than a 16 FT sign. Mr. Ouimet stated I tend to agree with Mr. Roberts and asked the applicant why they needed a 16 FT sign and why wouldn't 12 FT be sufficient? Mr. Early stated the following: For exactly that reason. It's permitted by the code and a 12 FT tall sign is going to come pretty much in the middle of that reader board once you drop it to 12 FT. There is 3.6 FT section of clad and if you take out everything but 6 inches of it, you're still in the middle of that reader board sign with parked vehicles. Truly, that's just the reality of it and it's not that we're trying to press the limit. Mr. Stigberg stated there are constantly vehicles in that area because after they are repaired we park them in that location. Mr. Ouimet stated the following: I understand what you're trying to do with the location that the sign is in and that sometimes there are vehicles and the SUV's parked there that would impair the vision of the sign. Mr. Early stated I'm saying the benefit to the applicant is such that you really have to consider this height of the sign. It would be much to their benefit if the sign is 16 FT high rather than to have it at 12 FT. There is nothing to be gained for AAA in the application if you reduce the sign height. Mr. Ouimet stated I think there is a lot to be gained for the Town to keep the signs at a uniform height and if the uniform height is 12 FT or that we strive to keep it at 12 FT, then I think 12 FT is what the Town wants. Mr. Early stated that is not what the code allows so I don't understand the necessity of dropping the sign to 12 FT. Mr. Ouimet stated the following: Every piece of property is unique and every sighting is special and everyone provides certain attributes. It seems to me that a 12 FT sign in that location is sufficiently high enough to see and accomplish what you need to accomplish. Mr. Roberts stated just because the code says 16 FT doesn't mean we have to approve a 16 FT sign. Mrs. Murphy stated you don't have to but you have to give a reason as to why it's not appropriate at that location. Mr. Berkowitz stated the following: Why is that sign not

centered? It's more on the north end instead of centered right in the middle of that island. Mr. Stigberg stated there is a telephone pole on that island. Mr. Early stated there is also a guide wire there and that's to make sure that the power company has complete access around that guide wire. Mrs. Murphy stated the following: I'm reading the ordinance and the Planning Board has the authority to further restrict the height of a sign so as to make the site compatible with the surrounding area. The surrounding area: The signs are generally 12 FT in height and that is what our sign Planning Board member is telling me. Mr. Early stated the following: We are not arguing with the fact that you have the power to do that. What we're saying is please consider what the applicant is requesting, which is to have a decent use of that reader board and we feel if you restrict it and drop it to the 12 FT, they are going to lose the use of that for a great deal of the day when vehicles are parked along there. Mr. Watts stated I tend to be a little more liberal and I think at Enterprise they have a 15.6 FT and its in keeping with the character and the old ordinance was 20 FT. Mr. Early stated if you want 15.6 FT, that would be fine but 12 FT is low. Mr. Watts stated I can see some of the arguments of the applicant too with the signage. I tend to be somewhere a little more than 12 FT. Mr. Early stated the following: On Route 146 the Sunoco Sign where the Dunkin Donuts is; by the time that signed got reduced to the applicable height, I had to put a Dunkin Donuts sign underneath there that's just about on the ground. So, when the snow piles up in a bad winter, I don't know if you're even going to see that Dunkin Donuts sign down there. So, that is one of the problems with reducing the overall height of free-standing signs. There are specific instances in which you want the sign to be taller and this is one of them. Mr. Berkowitz asked is snow going to be pushed over onto that island? Mr. Early stated hopefully not. Mr. Berkowitz stated the following: Because if it is, you are going to ruin the bottom of that sign. Personally, I don't like the white panels on the bottom. I'd rather see shrubs. Mr. Early stated the following: That's fine. The planting could be done. Like I said, we ran into a situation where the power company had tag line down into the ground and there is no particular easement there for them but we like to make sure that when their trucks come in to work in that area that they have free access completely around that area. So, that was taken as a consideration for the location of the sign. Mr. Berkowitz stated the following: I'm looking at the picture and you have two white panels on the bottom. The two white panels are drawing my eye toward the bottom instead of toward the sign. Mr. Early stated you have to remember that we're looking at it in a standing situation and you're going to be in a vehicle approaching the sign and with the way that curve is, you are going to see the main portion for viewing and you really wouldn't see the lower portion of the sign from a vehicle. Mr. Berkowitz stated I'm looking at the picture on the bottom. Mr. Higgins asked why do you need those two bottom panels? Mr. Early stated it's not an absolute necessity, but if you want to see two skinny poles with the top being top heavy, it's all about esthetics. Mr. Higgins stated I think Mr. Berkowitz is trying to say that if you eliminate those two panels and put a couple of evergreen trees in, that would look better. Mr. Berkowitz stated yes, that would look nicer and it would open it up a little more. Mr. Ouimet stated the following: A 16 FT sign is obviously legal because it does comply with code and the code allows for a maximum of 16 FT. What I'm suggesting is that because there is no depression in the land where the sign is going to be located, there is no need for a 16 FT sign and that a 12 FT sign is sufficient. Mr. Berkowitz stated I agree but we're talking about two different things; we're talking about the height of the sign and also about getting rid of the bottom two panels to make it look nicer. Mr. Ouimet stated yes, I know but I don't want to get distracted from the height issue. Mr. Berkowitz and Mr. Ruchlicki stated we're not. Mr. Nadeau stated regarding the height issue; what is the height of the building? Mr. Early stated overall I don't know but I think it's approximately 25 FT. Mr. Nadeau stated the following: Okay, but I'm looking at the two signs that you have on the building and certainly anyone who is driving by can see those signs. So, I question why you would need the 16

FT sign. Mr. Stigberg stated we feel we need the 16 FT to get those letters up there to let people know that it is a auto repair facility and not just a AAA location. Mr. Early stated you don't want to be reading things below your eye level if possible. Mr. Berkowitz stated when you're going down the road, that sign is right at your eye level. Mr. Early stated exactly, at 16 FT. Mr. Berkowitz stated and also at 12 FT. Mr. Early stated it might be. Mr. Watts stated I like 14 FT. Mr. Nadeau stated then let's comprise at 14 FT. Mr. Williams asked what would be the minimum height of the reader board at the bottom that we could live with and asked could you reduce the size of the AAA sign? Mr. Early stated the following: Right. It's the existing sign and they're moving the location because the location of the sign was inadequate to begin with. The architect originally had the sign at 16 inches off grade and we brought it up about 3 FT to get it out of the snow bank but it's still inadequate where it is. Mr. Ruchlicki stated the following: I understand the height problem but I have an issue with the white panels on the bottom of the sign. Maybe in the wintertime you'd never know that they were there but the picture that I'm looking at with the green grass and the way those two white panels are in my opinion are nothing more than a visual distraction. You'll be able to see the sign and read the sign as AAA and then the board underneath it with the literature on it. You said something about a lollipop situation; well I still think you could put something there below that, be it a shrub, a hedge, or something, that would improve that island regardless of the guide wire. The way it looks in the picture and when you are driving down the road, the first thing you're going to see is all that white and you're not even going to look up to see what literature is above it. That's just my opinion. Ms. Zepko stated an option would be to put the address, 1647 Route 9 on the bottom of the second panel so their address is established for safety reasons as well and that could break up the white visually. Mr. Early stated the following: That's fine and if they want to put in low shrubs there it would cover most of the lower portion of the sign. It's a little difficult as we have it to the back part of that small island and we're pretty close to the concrete curbing where the footings are going to be. So, we'll try to give them a little more space so they can get some plantings in there. Mr. Berkowitz stated that would also allow that car to pull out and give them something to see if another car is coming the other way. Mr. Early asked so if we give you some plantings to cover the lower portion and put the address on the other portion, would we be good to go? Mr. Nadeau stated I will make the motion to set the sign at 14 FT.

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

Free-standing Sign:

Sign Size: 126 SF

Sign Dimensions: 8ft x 8ft

Total Height: 14 ft

Sided: ☐ one-sided ☒ Two-sided

Location of Sign: free-standing

Lighted: ☒ Internal ☐ Flood

Mr. Nadeau made a motion to approve the sign application for AAA Car Care Center condition on the maximum height of the sign will be 14 FT, the panel underneath the "reader board" incorporates the site's address and that there are landscape plantings added to the base of the sign to 'soften' the appearance. Mr. Berkowitz seconded. Approved by a 6-1 vote: Mr. Watts – Aye, Mr. Berkowitz – Aye, Mr. Nadeau – Aye, Mr. Ruchlicki – Aye, Mr. Higgins – Aye, Mr. Ouimet – Aye, Mr. Roberts – Nay. Motion carried.

Mr. Ruchlicki made a motion to adjourn the February 27, 2012 Planning Board Meeting at 7:47 pm. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
Milly Pascuzzi
Planning Board Secretary