

**MEETING MINUTES
Town of Halfmoon Planning Board
July 27, 2015**

Those present at the July 27, 2015 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board Members: John Ouimet ó Chairman
Don Roberts ó Vice Chairman
Rich Berkowitz
Marcel Nadeau
Tom Ruchlicki - absent
John Higgins

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

Chairman Ouimet opened the Planning Board Meeting at 7:00 PM.

Mr. Higgins made a motion to approve the July 13, 2015 minutes with changes, seconded by Mr. Nadeau. Vice-Chairman Roberts abstained. Motion was carried.

Public Hearings:

15.037 Aurentz, 21 Lape Road – Subdivision Lot Line Adjustment

Chairman Ouimet commented: The public hearing opened at 7:01 PM, would anyone like the notice read? No one chose to speak.

Mr. Tim Aurentz commented: I own approximately 5.51 acres at 21 Lape Road in Halfmoon. What I would like to do through a lot line adjustment is convey approximately 1.78 acres of land as shown on the survey to MCBS, Inc., my neighbor Greg Bombard who lives right next door is a partner in MCBS, Inc. and he is here tonight if you have any questions for him.

We had to get an Area Variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals because the house was built in 1928 is not setback far away from the road according to today's Zoning Ordinance. I was granted an Area Variance from the Zoning Board because it was an expansion of a pre-existing non-conforming use.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Does anyone from the public wish to speak? No one chose to speak. The public hearing closed at 7:02 PM. Would anyone from the Board wish to speak?

Mr. Berkowitz made a motion to declare Negative Declaration under SEQRA, seconded by Vice-Chairman Roberts. Motion was carried.

Mr. Berkowitz made a motion to approve the minor subdivision for 21 Lape Road, seconded by Vice-Chairman Roberts. Motion was carried.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Subdivision approved. Thank you.

15.084 Adirondack Basement Systems, Route 9 – Minor Subdivision/ Lot Line Adjustment – Route 9 and Stone Quarry Road

Chairman Ouimet commented: The public hearing opened at 7:04 PM. Would anyone from the public like to have the Public Notice read? No one chose to speak.

Mr. Kevin Koval commented: I am the owner and President of Adirondack Basement Systems and I am looking to purchase a piece of property on Route 9 and Stone Quarry Road. The purpose of this meeting is to obtain a 50' lot line adjustment to have a 50' swath of land going out to Stone Quarry Road so that in the future we could have access to Stone Quarry Road instead of just having it out to Route 9.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Would anyone from the public wish to speak?

Mr. Matthew Kennedy, 147 Stone Quarry Road commented: Is that access planned to be used as a driveway or what is the intention?

Mr. Koval commented: The intention is that in the future somewhere down the road I would like to build a new building there for my company and that would be an access point to Stone Quarry Road.

Mr. Kennedy commented: Would it be for the trucks going in and out through Stone Quarry Road or would they use Route 9. If it was going to be Route 9 access was it going to be for Commercial use?

Mr. Koval commented: That was our thinking that we would put our trucks out onto there. Currently, we have 3 box trucks and 2 parcel vans that we use so it's not a heavy amount of traffic.

Mr. Kennedy commented: There is no other plan and nothing is being approved as far as clearing the lot or building anything at this point. It is just for a lot-line adjustment.

Chairman Ouimet commented: No sir, it is just for a lot-line adjustment.

Mr. Kennedy commented: Those are probably my biggest questions.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Would anyone else from the public wish to speak?

Mrs. Ellen Kennedy, 151 Stone Quarry Road commented: I am adjacent to this property. My concern has always been with a development on Stone Quarry Road and the traffic that it generates. I

am not quite sure which parcel he is purchasing that he is accessing. I can see 2-lot lines there and I am not sure which one he is talking about.

Mr. Koval commented: The lot that I am purchasing is the lower of the two lots. You can see a dashed line going out to Route 9 that is straight from the rear of your property that is the lot line now and what I am intending to do is have a 50øwide swath going to Stone Quarry Road and in exchange for that adjust the lot line to the south for essentially an even exchange of property.

Mrs. Kennedy commented: I guess I am not sure what you are exchanging?

Mr. Koval commented: We would be exchanging that 50øwide swath for the pie shaped wedge that is going out to Route 9.

Mrs. Kennedy commented: I am wondering why your not using Route 9 as an exit instead of coming out on Stone Quarry and adding to our traffic problems there? My biggest concern as I say is the traffic. The intersection with Stone Quarry Road and Route 9 is a very difficult one now and any increase in traffic is what I am concerned about. I wish you were going out on Route 9.

Mr. Koval commented: Currently at this time, there are no plans in place for any building or construction of any kind on this piece of property so a lot-line adjustment for this purpose is strictly for the future. This is not intended to approve any type of construction, any type of moving of the business or anything, it is strictly to have the future possibility of going out to Stone Quarry Road. It is not saying that when I do construct a building there that I wonø be required to go out through Route 9. I just donø want to cut myself short and not have that option.

Chairman Ouimet commented: All that is before the Board tonight is the lot-line adjustment. It is just to transfer a piece of property to the upper lot in exchange for a swath of property that in the future could be used to access Stone Quarry Road. It is not saying that it will be used to access Stone Quarry Road. There is no building and no proposed development of the lot before the Board tonight just the property exchange. Does that answer your question? Do you have anything else? This is your chance to talk.

Mrs. Kennedy commented: I am just concerned if he doesnø do the development what is he planning on doing then heø created another avenue for maybe a much denser use of the property if he doesnø use it that way. He is more or less setting it up for a future use that might be a negative. I understand itø just a lot-line but once you change it and you give access then you have changed the dynamics of the property.

Chairman Ouimet commented: I think you may hear comments from the Board that may address some of the concerns that you have so I just ask you to be patient. Would anyone else from the public wish to speak?

Mr. Joel Koval commented: I am the applicantø brother! I am also the Real Estate Agent that is handling the sale of the parcel. I was actually the one that suggested that we do this and there were a couple of reasons for that. The Department of Transportation (DOT) can be a little persnickety sometimes especially about a left hand turning motion if we go out directly to Route 9. We donø know if that is going to happen or not but we wanted to cover the possibility that they would only allow a right in right out if the access is to Route 9. The other issue is bringing in the utilities the water and sewer is on Stone Quarry Road. The idea would be to bring that in from that side as opposed to having to work

in the ROW of Route 9. Again, all of this is you know, we don't know yet because he really isn't looking to build the building as of yet but to protect his interest if that is the way that it goes then we need to bring in utilities and DOT doesn't allow anything other than a right in and a right out it just makes sense to have that 50' swath.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Thank you. Would anyone else from the public wish to speak? If not I will close the Public Hearing at 7:15 PM and will open it up to the Board for questions.

Mr. Nadeau commented: I believe that at the previous meeting when you proposed this that I made the statement that we are doing the subdivision but in no way does this mean that a site plan would be approved so I just want to make you aware of that.

Mr. Koval commented: Yes, thank you.

Mr. Higgins commented: Also, at the previous meeting you said that because the elevation changes you couldn't get out to Route 9.

Mr. Koval commented: You can do pretty much anything with the right amount of fill and an excavator. There is a depression between the property and Route 9 but where that lot-line is if you look at the gradient lines right at the left edge I suppose you could put a road on the current grading that is there. It would require a bit of excavation at quite a large expense but anything is possible.

Mr. Higgins commented: As far as the access to the apartment complex across the road we were looking at it in the pre-meeting and it looks like it is very close where those two almost line up but don't quite line up. I just want to let you know that the Board is going to have safety concerns of any kind of an access going out where you have your 50'

Mr. Koval commented: Again, this isn't in relation to any type of construction it is just for a lot-line adjustment.

Mr. Higgins commented: I understand but the Board talked about it in the pre-meeting and we just want to alert you to the fact that you may have a problem using that 50' somewhere down the road in the future. There are no plans of using that as your access. We just want to go on record to make sure that you realize that you have been informed that there maybe a problem.

Mr. Koval commented: Thank you.

Mrs. Sautter commented: Have you heard from the Saratoga County Planning Board?

Mr. Koval commented: I have not. I have not had any contact with them.

Mrs. Sautter commented: Have we heard from them in regards to the Route 9 and/or Stone Quarry Road comments?

Chairman Ouimet commented: Rich, has this been referred to the County?

Mr. Harris commented: Yes it was and their response was that there was No Significant County Wide Impact but offered comments: "This project will give the lot with the existing Route 9 frontage access from both State and Town Roads with consideration for future land purchase and office construction

with drive access from Town Road. Recommendations to the Town Planning Board were later submitted of the site plan provided for closing of any Route 9 access.ö

Mrs. Sautter commented: I just want to clarify for those people that said there was a problem that they had with anything that is going on in there and I know that is not for this but once again just to give you the heads up that is what they said that it would not go through Route 9.

Mr. Harris commented: I do want to mention though if he or somebody else comes in for a site plan to develop the lot, to construct anything that would also have to get sent back to the County Planning Board where they would get to see where the access is proposed and either approve, deny, or approve with conditions. They would look back at their prior statements and that would be a good indication of where you might go in the future.

Mr. Koval commented: Am I correct in understanding that essentially the land would then be landlocked for commercial use because of Saratoga County saying they wouldn't want Route 9 access and this Board indicating that it is probably likely that it wouldn't have Stone Quarry Road access would that then make it a landlocked parcel?

Mrs. Murphy commented: I am going to just say that the Board is not indicating anything with regards to where your accessing they are just looking at a subdivision. They are hearing what the neighbors concerns are and they are passing along what the County stated but in no way are they making any determination with regards to what the access would be on a future site plan that doesn't yet exist for a company or a building that hasn't been planned and we don't know what the use is.

Mr. Koval commented: But there was concern indicated about the access to Stone Quarry Road if I am correct.

Mrs. Murphy commented: That is correct.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Are there any other comments?

Mr. Higgins made a motion to declare a negative declaration for SEQRA, seconded by Mr. Berkowitz. Motion was carried.

Mr. Higgins made a motion to approve the subdivision as presented on the corner of Route 9 and Stone Quarry Road, seconded by Mr. Berkowitz. Motion was carried.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Subdivision is approved, thank you.

15.089/15.094 Paul & Madeline Sicko, 1410 & 1414 Route 9 – Minor Subdivision, Lot Line Adj., and Special Use Permit

Chairman Ouimet commented: I will open the Public Hearing at 7:16 PM, would anyone like the notice read? No one chose to speak.

Mr. Duane Rabideau, Van Guilder Associates commented: I am representing Paul and Madeline Sicko for their request for a lot-line adjustment and a Special Use Permit. The parcel is located at 1410 and 1414 Route 9 which is on the west side of Route 9 just north of the Crescent Bridge. The proposal

is to annex 1414 Route 9 which is approximately 3.88 acres with 1410 Route 9 which is approximately 11 acres to make a total parcel of 15 acres. Once that is combined next is the subdivision of approximately 1.07 acres around the commercial plaza that exists and then we would also ask for a Special Use Permit which is required because the proposed action involves a single-family house within the C-1 Commercial Zone?

Chairman Ouimet commented: Would anyone from the public wish to speak? The public hearing closed at 7:18 PM. Would anyone from the Board like to speak?

Mr. Higgins commented: I am a little confused. You are going to combine the 11.87 acres in the back with the 3.88 acre parcel and if you keep the shed display there you will have commercial and residential on the same lot?

Mr. Rabideau commented: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Higgins commented: Lyn is that acceptable?

Mrs. Murphy commented: We already approved that when we approved the shed display.

Mr. Higgins commented: At that time, that was on a different parcel than the house.

Mrs. Murphy commented: No, it was the same lot.

Chairman Ouimet commented: You are combining one lot with another lot, correct?

Mr. Rabideau commented: Yes this lot with this lot the house is located about here and the sheds are right here. The sheds and the house were always on the same lot.

Mr. Higgins commented: Ok, I misunderstood and thought it was a separate lot. That is why I asked the question. Thank you.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Are there any other questions from the Board?

Mr. Berkowitz made a motion to declare a negative declaration for SEQRA, seconded by Vice-Chairman Roberts. Motion was carried.

Mr. Berkowitz made a motion to approve the Minor Subdivision, Lot Line Adjustment and Special Use Permit, seconded by Vice-Chairman Roberts. Motion was carried.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Negative Declaration approved, Subdivision, Special Use Permit approved. Thank you.

New Business:

15.087 Red Robin, 1 Halfmoon Crossing - Sign

Mark Hoffman, Owner of Capital Signs and Graphics commented: We were here a couple of months ago. We received an approval for most of the Red Robin Signs. We were a little over on the square footage so we reduced the signage to 97 SF to be approved and move forward. What we are

going to do is take off the back end where the dumpster area is located that had a Red Robin logo which we are going to remove and we are going to keep it on the side and keep it under 97 SF.

Chairman Ouimet commented: It would max out the signage for the site. The signage will be no more than 97 SF total for signage. Rich, have you looked at the proposal as presented?

Mr. Marlow commented: According to what we have gotten from them there would be no more than 97 SF and it would max out the allowable square footage for the building.

Vice Chairman Roberts commented: If it conforms to the Code of Halfmoon for signage and as long as the applicant knows that is it for signage.

Vice Chairman Roberts made a motion to approve the signage for Red Robin so long as they don't exceed 97 SF, seconded by Mr. Nadeau. Motion was carried.

15.102 J. Danforth Office Building, 5 Liebich Lane – Amendment to Site Plan

Mr. Joe Dannible, Environmental Design Partnership commented: We are here on behalf of John W Danforth Companies and their application for a 20,000 SF addition to an existing 60,000 SF Flex Warehouse building located at 5 Liebich Lane. I am here with Thomas Shannon and Frank Levy of JW Danforth that maybe able to answer any questions related to the use at the facility itself. They were in front of the Board within the last couple of months when they purchased the property in order to get a Change of Use/Change of Tenant for this Building which this Board did approve. Previously the Building was approved in 2012 or maybe in early 2013 by Baron Company for a 60,000 SF Flex Space. At the time, we estimated the building would be one third office space and two thirds warehousing space. The plan itself provided for 150 vehicles to park and again that was based on some numbers and assumptions of the amount of employees within the warehouse space. The project as we are proposing it now proposes that in the dark area off the southwest corner of the building a 20,000 SF two-story building 10,000 SF on the first floor and 10,000 SF on the second floor which will be primarily used for the office space for the building. The remainder of the 60,000 SF area would be used for the fabrication of the metal and the duct work that they do for their business. This will be their Capital Region Corporate Office and should be about the simplest 20,000 SF addition we have looked at. We have an existing parking lot that is located directly under the building. The parking lot itself is roughly 16,000 SF of pavement and we are replacing that with approximately 10,000 SF of building so we are going to have a reduction in the amount of impervious area on the site. Now that we have a user for the building we have been able to calculate actual parking demand based upon the Town Code and also based upon what the applicants believe will be their maxed potential for this site at build-out. Under Town Code the warehouse area of the 60,000 SF is believed that they will have no more than 50 employees at any one time within that building which would equate to about 33 parking spaces. Then we have a 20,000 SF office use which equates to roughly 100 parking spaces. The total parking demand by Town Code is 133 parking spaces which we have provided on our plan. We have 99 paved parking spaces along the front of the building and 34 land banked parking along the northeastern side of the building. What we have done to accommodate the land banked spaces is on the previously approved site plan we had 20 land banked spaces in this area and 14 land banked spaces over here along the side of the retention pond in the area where we are building the addition. Taking those 14 parking spaces and add them over to this area will bring us up to 133 parking spaces which meets the Town demand. The applicants themselves believe their match parking demand at this facility is going to be in the range from 75-100 vehicles and that is why we are proving the 99 paved spaces out in front of the building. We talked about the over all disturbance for this project 30,000 SF and again we are actually decreasing the amount

impervious on the site by roughly 6,000 SF. The Town has reviewed the plans with the local Fire Department and they have no issue with the layout as proposed. There is a hydrant located approximately right here as part of the original plan. They did have a question about the fire connection and whether it was going to be combined with the buildings or separate. That is something we think we can work out with the Fire Department how exactly they want that and how we are going to plan it with the building. Again that is something we can deal with as a condition of approval if one is issued tonight. On the side of the building and was not provided to the Board for tonight's meeting is a perspective rendering of what the addition will look like. The blue metal panel siding and the brown siding on the existing building and the black grey colored building is what is being proposed as the addition. The main entrance to the building will be the shop front area with glass and then the accent will be metal panel material for the building. I look to see if the Board has any questions for us and we look forward to bringing this company to the area creating a lot of jobs in the area they are looking to expand the facility already. Thank you.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Thank you. Are there any questions from the Board?

Mr. Higgins commented: How many spaces did you say you are losing between where the buildings are going to go and then also relocating the land banked spaces?

Mr. Dannible commented: There are 155 parking spaces on the approved plan and we are having 133 parking spaces so there is roughly a loss of 24 parking spaces were losing.

Mr. Higgins commented: How many were approved on the original land banked area?

Mr. Dannible commented: Thirty-four parking spaces. On the northeast side of the building we had 20 parking spaces.

Mr. Higgins commented: So you are adding the 20 parking spaces and adding how many more spaces?

Mr. Dannible commented: We are adding the 14 parking spaces that were land banked on the southwest corner. We are not changing the land banked parking on the site.

Mr. Higgins commented: Land banked parking is now just green space?

Mr. Dannible commented: It will just be green space.

Mr. Higgins commented: I believe that it is paved now or is it grass now?

Mr. Dannible commented: There is an access road that goes through the middle of those areas and wraps completely around the building but the parking spaces associated with those land banked ones are not paved they are grass.

Mr. Higgins commented: How about the other end of the building? There is an access road there too.

Mr. Dannible commented: There is no access through the parking lot there is however a shared access off of Liebich Lane that comes up here and dead ends and this is the primary tractor trailer access for the lot we are proposing no changes to that.

Mr. Higgins commented: But you said you were increasing the green space. Yes, a 6,000 SF increase of green space and that is just the existing paved parking lot which is roughly 16,000 SF and replacing that with a 10,000 SF building and some sidewalks maybe it is really more like 5,000 SF.

Mr. Higgins commented: But you are going to take the pavement and remove it and make that into green space or landscaping.

Mr. Dannible commented: Yes. There will be landscaping around the building and some sort of a hard scape outside the building for outdoor patio for the employees to go out and eat their lunch and enjoy the outdoors.

Mrs. Sautter commented: On the proposed office building is that currently all black top? I see a kidney shape I am not sure if it's elevation distance but underneath of it?

Mr. Dannible commented: It is all blacktop. On the approved plan it was a hashed out area at the end of the parking isles it was just stripped pavement striping.

Mrs. Sautter commented: It was just a little green space area.

Mr. Dannible commented: I don't even believe it was green space I believe everything in that parking lot is paved.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Are there any other questions from the Board?

Mr. Partlow commented: You are not disturbing any of the storm water management system is that correct?

Mr. Dannible commented: No. The only thing that we will have to do is there is a roof leader that comes out into this pond we will have to re-locate that as part of the new addition.

Chairman Ouimet commented: If there are no other questions may I have a motion on SEQRA?

Mr. Higgins made a motion to declare a negative declaration on SEQRA, seconded by Mr. Berkowitz. Motion was carried.

Mr. Higgins made a motion to approve the addition for 5 Liebich Lane as proposed with the condition that the Fire Department approves the design, seconded by Mr. Berkowitz. Motion was carried.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Approved condition on Fire Department. Thank you.

15.101 Loomis Revised Site Plan, Harris Rd & Lape Rd - Amendment to Site Plan

Mr. Duane Rabideau, Van Guilder Associates commented: I am representing Mr. Eddie Sze for a revised site plan of the Loomis Subdivision that was approved in 2008. The parcel is located on the southwest corner of Harris and Lape Roads. The issue is when the subdivision was approved there was going to be a common curb cut for Lots 3 and 4 out onto Harris Road but sometime after the subdivision National Grid decided to put a brand new pole right on the property line so that blocked the proposed access. They put in a new pole and apparently they are going to leave the original pole also. I am not sure why but that is what we were told. The client ending up putting the driveway straight in for this house and Saratoga County Dept. of Public Works is only going to allow this one curb cut onto Harris

Road so we have no access for Lot 3 but we are proposing to put the proposed curb cut for Lot 3 where the original driveway was for the Loomis house. The only thing we are going to change is putting in an egress ingress easement through a portion of Lot 2 and for this portion of the driveway to cross and we are not changing any of the lot lines.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Thank you. Rich, has this been referred to the County Planning Board?

Mr. Harris commented: Yes, the County Planning Department did not feel that this necessitates a review by the County Planning Board but it was referred to County Commissioner of Public Works who reviewed it and found it acceptable as it does not negatively impact Harris Road or Lape Road. The Town Superintendent of Highway, John Pingelski also reviewed the plan since it proposes a new access for a permanent residence on Lape Road and he found it acceptable also.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Now I understand there is some issue with the driveway height or elevation for Lot 4?

Mr. Harris commented: Yes, the Building Department has been working with the owner to change or have him change the elevation to reduce the steepness of the slope of the driveway on Lot 4.

Chairman Ouimet commented: So whatever is going to be decided by the Board tonight will not affect Lot 4 at all it is just a re-location of the driveway on Lot 3.

Mr. Rabideau commented: That is correct it is just for access to Lot 3.

Chairman Ouimet commented: The applicant understands that?

Mr. Rabideau commented: I wasn't aware of the issue with the steepness of the driveway John brought that to my attention but I didn't know it was an issue with the Building Department.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Are there any other questions from the Board?

Mr. Higgins commented: Yes, I mentioned about the steepness Duane and I didn't know until tonight that there was a problem with the Building Department. I know we are talking about Lot 3 but if you can't do anything with Lot 4 there is no room for one driveway between the old pole and the new pole?

Mr. Rabideau commented: No, one of the other issues is there is a guide wire.

Mr. Higgins commented: Ok that answered my question. Thank you.

Mr. Nadeau commented: Duane a question on the easement do you have that easement?

Mr. Rabideau commented: No we can create it; it is the same order with Lot 2 and Lot 3.

Mrs. Murphy commented: I know that your point to that question because they have frontage technically on Lape Road the Town's standards are satisfied pursuant to the Town Law. The decision to create an ingress egress easement between the two of them is a private decision for the two land owners to make.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Are there any other questions from the Board?

Vice Chairman Roberts made a motion to approve this application as presented, seconded by Mr. Nadeau. Motion was carried.

Chairman Ouimet commented: It's approved. Thank you.

15.092 A Peaceful Place Massage, 1404 Route 9 – Change of Tenant/Use/Sign

Mr. Zachary Palmer, Capital Self-Storage commented: We had a tenant come down from Clifton Park I was unaware that I needed to have a Change of Use. The building was inspected I was notified and submitted the proper paperwork and I am hoping that everything goes smoothly. I am here to answer any questions.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Thank you. Have you looked at the parking requirements for this use?

Mr. Harris commented: Yes the paved parking lot as previously approved has 28 parking spaces shown and the Code technically and the strict application of the formula requires 34 parking spaces as briefly discussed at the pre-meet even though there is 28 lined spaces there does appear to be room on the southern part of the site and the northern part of the site to accommodate 2-4 extra spaces even though they may not be lined. You can actually see them in this picture a vehicle parked there that is not a lined space. This driveway is shut off and is closed to traffic but in this area here and over here you could fit a few spaces. There is enough to meet the 34 parking space requirement even though only 28 are shown as drawn.

Mr. Higgins commented: I am sorry I didn't get your name?

Mr. Palmer commented: Zachary Palmer.

Mr. Higgins commented: Are you the manager for Eric Tanski?

Mr. Palmer commented: Mr. Tanski no longer owns that property we purchased it from Mr. Tanski a year and a half ago.

Mr. Higgins commented: The reason I ask is that the Board was not aware that the property had been sold. Two things: The gated emergency access is part of your property?

Mr. Palmer commented: In the storage facility area? Yes. But this would be no gate involved for this.

Mr. Higgins commented: I understand that. That area has been used in the past as a display area for vehicles and trucks being sold. That is an emergency access only and it should not be used as a display area for equipment, vehicles or anything being sold. The previous owner was aware of that and I know several times the Building Inspector has mentioned that to him. We just want to go on record that the emergency access can not be used as a display area for anything being sold and that it has to be kept open for emergencies.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Are there any other questions from the Board? Have you looked at the sign request?

Vice Chairman Roberts commented: There was not one in my packet I will have to defer to our Planning staff here.

Mr. Marlow commented: The signs are already in place and they are direct panel swaps of what was previously there they fit the existing mounts for the old signs so they do meet the Code as far as the signage goes.

Mrs. Murphy commented: Rich does he own the Storage Units as well?

Mr. Harris commented: I would have to look that up.

Mrs. Murphy commented: My only question being does he have access for the storage and if he had bought the building and the access from the front.

Mr. Palmer commented: We do own the Storage Units, yes.

Mr. Harris commented: It is all one lot. Was it bought as one purchase?

Mr. Palmer commented: Yes.

Vice Chairman Roberts made a motion to approve the Change of Tenant/ Use and Sign, seconded by Mr. Berkowitz. Motion was carried.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Approved. Thank you.

15.095 Access Auto Sales, 1516 Crescent VF Road – Change of Tenant/Use

Chairman Ouimet commented: Do we have any maps?

Mr. Harris commented: This shows the overall lot with Anthony Motor Cars and this is where they propose Access Auto Sales. The existing shop is where the applicant is proposing to use that he is going to describe.

Mr. Joseph Lombardi commented: I am the owner of Access Auto Sales. I propose a change of tenant and use for 1516 Crescent VF Road in the existing area behind Anthony Motor Cars. The current use of that shop was a mechanical shop I work close with Anthony Motor Cars on retail. I need a space to hang my license in the back shop. We are mainly going to be doing whole sale out of there so there won't be any retail customers entering that area as far as automotive goes because we sell all the retail cars out of the front. I am also looking for six proposed u-haul spaces. We have a u-haul franchise that we are not able to use right now it is kind of dormant until we get the approvals from the Town to use the space.

Chairman Ouimet commented: How many parking spaces are being proposed?

Mr. Lombardi commented: I am looking for 6 u-haul spaces I don't always have six they said they could provide me with 3-4 at a time. It is a small satellite u-haul rental.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Thank you. Are there any questions from the Board?

Vice Chairman Roberts commented: So you want to have a maximum of six u-hauls.

Mr. Lombardi commented: Correct.

Mr. Higgins commented: And you show 2 employee parking spaces?

Mr. Lombardi commented: The 2 employee parking spaces I don't have any employees but the two employee spaces were existing. I just put them in there because they were existing.

Mr. Higgins commented: Where do you propose to park vehicles that you are getting ready to work on?

Mr. Lombardi commented: For the whole sale there would be a maximum I would say about four to five there at a time. They turn around pretty quick because they go right to another owner within a 2-5 day period.

Mr. Berkowitz commented: So you are going to have a maximum of 6 spaces for u-hauls?

Mr. Lombardi commented: Correct.

Mr. Berkowitz commented: And 4-5 spaces for cars and 2 employee spaces.

Mr. Lombardi commented: Yes. I don't have any employees but yes you can call that employee spaces.

Mr. Berkowitz commented: For me that adds up to 13 parking spaces.

Mr. Lombardi commented: Correct.

Mr. Berkowitz commented: You had 7 existing parking spaces.

Mr. Lombardi commented: I have 7 parking spaces in the front and the existing ones I am asking for the 6 u-hauls in the front. If you go back to plan you can see the existing spaces that are there. The employees are off to the right then there are three spaces along the side of the building and then two more there.

Mr. Berkowitz commented: That is seven parking spaces. You have a potential of 13 including the u-hauls. How will that fit?

Mr. Lombardi commented: Yes that is correct. The area that the u-haul spaces are going to be parked is all gravel and was gravel.

Mr. Berkowitz commented: Which map are you presenting?

Mr. Lombardi commented: I am looking at the hand drawn map. Those 6 parking spaces is gravel.

Mr. Berkowitz commented: Ok, I was looking at the other map showing 7 parking spaces.

Mr. Harris commented: This whole area is gravel and paved.

Mr. Lombardi commented: Yes and behind the building too. The Town Road ends if you are going from the top of the map down to the bottom it ends at the Shop right there.

Chairman Ouimet commented: That is actually in the Town Road that is an easement.

Mr. Lombardi commented: Yes for the house behind it. There is a house off to the right side.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Yes, it's the one on the lower part of your drawing.

Mr. Berkowitz commented: Can you fit extra parking spaces on your site plan to where it says gravel?

Mr. Lombardi commented: I could but I don't need those.

Mr. Berkowitz commented: But you could.

Chairman Ouimet commented: I am a bit confused. I see the spaces and I understand what you want to do. Where are you going to flow the traffic. Where are the trucks going to back up and pull in?

Mr. Lombardi commented: They can go out Morris Lane.

Chairman Ouimet commented: How are they going to get to it if you have cars parked in 5 parking spaces?

Mr. Lombardi commented: The six parking spaces and to the right of the parking spaces there is gravel and they are backed up far enough there is probably from the existing shop there is probably 80' of gravel that goes out.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Will the trucks enter the lot on the easement road or on the on the paper street that is there?

Mr. Lombardi commented: They would go on the easement road on the Morris Lane.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Through Anthony Motors?

Mr. Lombardi commented: They could come either way through there.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Then they would drive across the gravel in no defined manner anyway you can get it in or out of there?

Mr. Lombardi commented: I guess you can say that, yes.

Chairman Ouimet commented: I don't know if anybody else is as confused as I am but I think what I would like to do is put together a committee of 2-3 Members to go out and take a look to see if they could meet on site with you and you can explain to them where everything is going to be.

Mr. Higgins commented: Is this all one site with Anthony Motors?

Mr. Lombardi commented: No it is two separate buildings and two separate addresses.

Chairman Ouimet commented: But it is one parcel, right?

Mr. Lombardi commented: Yes it is one parcel all together.

Mr. Higgins commented: So the green space is going to be combined green space between both businesses.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Correct.

Mr. Lombardi commented: I am not changing any of the existing gravel or green space or anything that was there.

Mr. Higgins commented: Well you are because you are going to use area that was previously green space lawn and now gravel.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Well maybe not John that is why we are going out to take a look.

Mr. Harris commented: John this area here is all gravel and you can see it when you go out there.

Mr. Higgins commented: This says lawn on the drawing that is why I am asking. This drawing it says lawn.

Mr. Harris commented: A lot has probably happened since the last tenant. There is a lot of gravel and pavement here.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Can I have some volunteers from the Board? Don, John, and Margaret if you would coordinate through the Town Planning Department these folks can go out there and take a look and we will get you back at the next meeting and hopefully we can move on from there. Thank you.

Mr. Higgins made a motion to table until the committee has a chance to look at the site, seconded by Vice Chairman Roberts. Motion carried.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Committee to the site. We will put you back on for the next meeting.

15.103 PosiGen NY LLC, 11 Solar Drive – Change of Tenant/Use

Mr. Scott Rakowski, Manager of PosiGen commented: We are looking to lease space for 5 years at 11 Solar Drive.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Rich did you take a look at this request with regards to the parking requirements?

Mr. Marlow commented: We did take a look at it there does appear to be adequate parking at the site there are no other tenants in the building right now.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Are you going to take the entire building?

Mr. Rakowski commented: Yes that is correct 12,000 SF.

Chairman Ouimet commented: And there is no outside storage proposed? Everything will be in the building. Are there any questions from the Board?

Mr. Higgins commented: The applicant is aware that there is no parking allowed on Solar Drive so if you are having some kind of big sale or convention it all has to be within your parking area.

Mr. Rakowski commented: It is not retail space. Yes we understand.

Mr. Higgins commented: In case you are having some kind of show or something just want to make sure because we have had problems in the past with people parking on Solar Drive and it really made an unsafe condition. Thank you.

Vice Chairman Roberts commented: You are not going to have any outside storage there right?

Mr. Berkowitz made a motion to approve the change of tenant and use for 11 Solar Drive, seconded by Mr. Nadeau. Motion was carried.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Approved change of tenant and use. Thank you. Welcome to Halfmoon.

Old Business:

15.012 Harbor Freight Retail Dvmt. 1617 Route 9 – Commercial Site Plan

Mr. Jason Dell, Engineer for Lansing Engineering commented: I am here on behalf of the applicant Mr. Scott Earl for the project. The project site is located just north of the Halfmoon Sandwich Shop it is currently three parcels that will all be consolidated into one parcel that is approximately 6.82 acres. The site plan has been revised since the last time we were before the Board. The Harbor Freight Building will be 15,000 SF and it is still located along the western portion of the property fronting on Route 9. The revisions to the site plan occur on the eastern side currently out there on site right now is three apartment buildings. One of the apartment buildings will be raised in a new 3200 SF building; it will be constructed along the northern property line. The other two apartment buildings will be reconstructed in place and will continue to occupy approximately 3200 SF each. The parking on site exceeds the requirements for the Town of Halfmoon Code. Storm water will be managed on site per DEC regulations. Water and sewer services will be provided to the site the Halfmoon Water Supply will be connected along Route 9 and Saratoga County Sewer will be connected further to the north. At this point in time, we have addressed all of CHA's comments and the various comment letters that we have received and last week we also received a memorandum of understanding from the County so the County has looked at the revised site plan and is ok with it. So we are here tonight to answer any questions that the Board may have and to request approval for the project.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Thank you. Are there any questions from the Board?

Mr. Higgins commented: During one of the original presentations you said that Harbor Freight wanted to own the site so has that changed now?

Mr. Dell commented: Yes. That has changed there is a ground meets that will be in place with Harbor Freight.

Mr. Higgins commented: Ok. Also, your showing the line kind of goes through the existing parking lot for the Halfmoon Sandwich Shop is you proposing that the Halfmoon Sandwich Shop now has sufficient parking on its own piece so it doesn't have to use any of this parking?

Mr. Dell commented: No, the Halfmoon Sandwich Shop is going to be incorporated it is all part of the same project parcels. This boundary is to show pretty much just the project boundary area but they are all on one parcel that will be consolidated.

Mr. Higgins commented: So you are going to consolidate the deeds for all of this on one deed.

Mr. Dell commented: That is correct. The Halfmoon Sandwich Shop will actually be getting additional parking through this site plan.

Mr. Higgins commented: As far as the existing residential units you said that one was going to be torn down the other two were going to be retro fitted.

Mr. Dell commented: Re-constructed.

Mr. Higgins commented: Is that all going to be done at the same time as they are building the Harbor Freight Building?

Mr. Dell commented: Yes.

Mr. Higgins commented: So you are not going to have any concerns about tenants going an active construction area and there will not be any tenants back there when the construction starts.

Mr. Dell commented: Correct.

Mr. Higgins commented: Because obviously the safety concern with people traveling through construction sites.

Mr. Dell commented: Understood all the tenants will be out in 31 days?

Mr. Scott Earl commented: I am the owner of the property. The remaining four tenants were served with a 30-day evection notice we have month to month tenants there and they have all been aware for quite some time and they were actively looking. Under the construction phase of the project we are eliminating three power poles and a transformer behind the existing apartments in addition to the demolition of that first building. One of the benefits here we have three old non-conforming septic systems in the back that will be eliminated and connected with Saratoga County Sewer District through the use of grinder pumps. Also at this time we will be connecting by the request of the Planning Board the Halfmoon Sandwich Shop we have that on multi-million dollar septic system behind the Sandwich Shop. That will in the future allow us additional parking. It is good to have that connected to sewer as well.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Thank you. That septic system that is in place now for the PDD and the Sandwich Shop you are just going to abandon it?

Mr. Earl commented: I say my prayers every time I walk over there I don't know what else to do with it. It is huge and it is over kill the State made us put in a monster septic system and I agreed to do it. I say multi-million it was about \$870,000 for a septic system so it has been crazy. Right now there is lawn on it and picnic tables and people eat there lunch out there on top of it anyway.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Do they know it is there?

Mr. Earl commented: I don't know. There are three big manholes.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Thanks. Are there any questions from the Board?

Mr. Nadeau commented: Jason where is the dumpster located?

Mr. Dell commented: There is an existing dumpster for the Sandwich Shop here and there is a dumpster for behind Harbor Freight that is located here. If needed an additional dumpster pad can be put in this area or in this area over here.

Mr. Earl commented: Currently the existing apartment dumpster will be removed so there will be one less we still have one additional space in the Taj Mahal for the Halfmoon Sandwich Shop we have an extra dumpster pad there as well to serve the three buildings in the back. Everything is behind that fence which works.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Are there any other questions from the Board?

Vice Chairman Roberts made a motion to declare negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA, seconded by Mr. Mr. Higgins. Motion was carried.

Vice Chairman Roberts made a motion to approve the site plan as presented for Harbor Freight at 1617 Route 9, seconded by Mr. Nadeau. Motion was carried.

Chairman Ouimet commented: SEQRA is approved. Commercial Site Plan is approved. Thank you.

14.129 Betts Farm, Major Subdivision – PDD Recommendation

Mr. Gavin Vuillaume, Environmental Design Partnership commented: I am here tonight with Chris Abele to present Betts Farm. Betts Farm is an on-going Planned Development District that we started a few years back. The project was last in front of the Planning Board and Town Board back in October 2014 that is the last time we saw you folks. Currently the applicant is seeking a recommendation from the Planning Board over to the Town Board so the Town Board can make a decision on the actual zoning amendment to put in place the Planned Development District. We are here really more as just an update to the Board to give you more information to think about for your recommendation when you guys decide to get to that point. We did receive a comment letter back in January of this year from CHA and within that comment letter there was some significant and some not so significant comments that needed to be addressed. We have addressed all of those comments probably the most significant item that was requested from us was to prepare some additional SEQRA information. Along with that Mike can probably give you a little bit more background on it after I am through here. He also forwarded a lot of the pertinent information to interest agencies such as DEC, DOH, County Sewer, all of those outside reviewing agencies have reviewed the plans and I believe the only comments that we got back was from DEC and they didn't seem to be to concerned with the Town becoming Lead Agency for this project. I think we are still on track with that. Along with the interested agencies we also prepared a Part 3 or additional information which is attached to the Long Environmental Assessment Form in order so the Town can satisfy the requirements in the review procedures for SEQRA. Within that document there was some extensive narrative information that discussed things like the projects impacts on ground water, archeological resources, wetlands, drainage and a multitude of normal environmental SEQRA review items. With the additional information that we provided I think CHA thinks we are getting pretty close to being able to have a recommendation for SEQRA. With regards to the actual layout of the site I think back in January or last year when we presented it, it was a 222-unit project and due to some of the

site analysis work that we did I have one of the plans here in case you want to look at it in a little more detail. We analyzed the steep slopes that we finally did a delineation of wetlands and determined that there were some areas that just really weren't prone for development so we did reduce the density of the project down to 206-units. So we went from 222-units to 206-units. We made a couple little tweaks with some of the layout of the roads. One other item to note is that we did recently discover is that the Town Board may not be interested in the softball fields that we have been showing as our public benefit so we are continually working with the Town Board on establishing what the public benefit will be for this project. Although it's not a public benefit the other discussional item that we have been talking about the potential of maybe a school being located somewhere where those softball fields are located. The school is still somewhat interested and Chris could cover some of that but I don't think that they really seriously pursued any additional lands for a school. That last cul-de-sac at the bottom of the page will need some re-tooling as far as the layout I don't know if we will get any additional units we may shorten the cul-de-sac or play with that a little bit if the Town is no longer interested in the property there. We have the site analysis plan now that shows the 57-acres of constrained lands you do some of the math it comes out to 206-units. If you were to do a conventional subdivision I think that was another item that CHA had asked for. We did I think a conventional layout just utilizing the non-constrained lands and it comes out to about 132-units if we just did a straight subdivision. Again that is something to keep in the back of your mind as well. Lastly along with this project an item that we are also working with the Highway Department on is the development or the re-development of Betts Lane. Betts Lane is a non-conforming Road in the Town it needs to be widened and upgraded in order for this project and the applicant is willing to make those improvements. Again that is really to offset the new traffic that would come from the project it is not part of our public benefit we would like it to be but we understand that it is going to need some upgrades in order for it to service our project. We recently got some comments from the Planning Staff and we have made a couple of quick tweaks to the plan to show some additional right-of-way areas. It is not on this map I have another map and I will get it to you guys at some point it shows some additional stub streets that might bring road connections to some of the outskirt properties. Mainly the one to the north is Pingelski who is somewhat landlocked up there so we are going to have a stub street that will come off one of the lots at the top that could provide access to that land potentially in the future. The other thing that we discussed or that Rich had mentioned there was the trail committee they were interested in connecting trails and I know Chris has been very active with the trail system. It is no problem for us to run a trail down to the McDonald's Creek basically where we currently have shown a force main there is already an easement for the Sewer District so it shouldn't be a big deal to get a trail down into that area and have it meander its way through our project so we are not opposed to doing any additional trail work. I think those are all the updates for now. I leave it to you folks to see if you have any other questions or if Mike wants to explain SEQRA a little bit more I guess we could get into that a little bit more.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Thank you. Rich I understand that there were some comments from the Fire District.

Mr. Harris commented: Yes, I apologize for not getting it to you sooner. They just requested something that they said they were going to request on all projects and that is some type of fencing or protection around storm water management areas. They have a bigger issue requesting not just on this project but they came in to take a look at the revision today saw the storm water management areas and talked to Paul and the one request was a fence or some type of protection they are starting to require that. It has been kind of not a set situation from what I understand past approvals we know that in one subdivision off Kelly Lane the Planning Board required a split level fence given the proximity of the residential lots the storm water management areas are on Town property are set off a way from residences for example Cardin Acres they have not required so there hasn't been a set kind of policy.

Mr. Vuillaume commented: That is fine we are not at that level but we understand the need in certain instances for fencing that is not a problem.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Thank you. Are there any other questions from the Board?

Mr. Nadeau commented: I think the Board had concerns with site distance coming out onto Route 236 with the barn has anything been addressed with that?

Mr. Vuillaume commented: The site distance was evaluated by Green and Pearson so within the traffic report they discussed it they do note that it is not ideal but it does meet certain ASHTO requirements even though it is somewhat limited. It didn't require us to move the barn so we are not going to move the barn.

Mr. Higgins commented: Did they do site distances when they have the elevator out there and they are loading hay into the barn.

Mr. Vuillaume commented: Probably not.

Mr. Higgins commented: That is when it's a real problem when you have hay wagons and the elevator out there loading. Has John Pingelski seen this because previously he said that he wanted to try to minimize the number the cul-de-sacs because of the problem with plowing.

Mr. Vuillaume commented: He did make that comment and we did eliminate one cul-de-sac.

Mr. Higgins commented: And the circle coming in off of Betts Lane is that green area in the middle?

Mr. Vuillaume commented: That is green area similar to Glen Meadows.

Mr. Higgins commented: Ok are you going to have sufficient clearances for tractor trailers to make it around that?

Mr. Vuillaume commented: Yes it will be the same size as the one where we currently have at Glen Meadows which has been fine for a tractor trailer access.

Mr. Abele commented: It will be HOA maintained.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Are there any other questions from the Board? Michael are you in the process of reviewing this correct.

Mr. Bianchino commented: Yes, we had as Gavin had mentioned we were really going through the concept for the purposes for the SEQRA review we have requested some additional information which we have gotten and we are in the process of going through that were trying to draft for the Board's consideration some SEQRA findings so that is what we are in the process of doing right now.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Gavin one of the issues that has been very hot in the Town recently is the communal mail box structure I would suggest to you that you start to plan for that so when the site plan comes in we will take a look at that.

Mr. Vuillaume commented: It has become quite a problem in most municipalities and we are well aware of that and again we have one at Glen Meadows I don't know if that is one that you have seen yet but there is one there and we hope to have something very similar to that.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Chris please come up to the microphone please.

Mr. Chris Abele commented: Abele Builders, I am aware of that becoming a hot button issue but I do want some clarification and here is my question: Is the Town requiring that the mailboxes not be on public road right-of-way?

Mrs. Murphy commented: There has been on going discussions with regards to this issue and the basic outcome, and it is not set in stone, but in essence if you build something like you have in Glen Meadows we do not want that on Town property because if something happens to that it would be very expensive to replace. If you put it in a very basic mailbox that they deal with on a regular basis in the Town Highway Department that is fine but if you're building the gazebo with the set in mailboxes for the community we would prefer that be on the HOA property.

Mr. Abele commented: That makes sense to me but in Glen Meadows we have just the regular proto typical multi-unit mail box on the Town right-of-way. We did do that.

Mr. Harris commented: In his defense we had talked because we knew for a while that he was going to do a gazebo and an upscale version. That is not something the Highway Superintendent would want to maintain, have liability and maintenance. This has changed since you and I had talked about it. There was concern about the gazebo structure's landscaping, and steps, it was becoming a communal type of advocate in the Town right-of-way. The Highway Superintendent does not have concerns about the communal mailboxes by itself in the right-of-way it's when all the other things get added to it in the original plans for Glen Meadows. It was very hard to hear Rich on tape he was not really on the microphone and faded in and out.

Mr. Higgins commented: How about parking you have to have parking for all these people to come get their mail.

Mr. Abele commented: Well in the case of Glen Meadows we evaluated different scenarios so the one was as Rich said it was a communal type thing with an actual structure but in talking to the residences that was not the best solution. So when we talked with the post office they gave us four locations where we could have within the 126 unit development. They said we could pick four locations so that is what we chose to do now to answer your question what we did try to do with one of the locations of the communal mailbox was put it in like a green area in Glen Meadows so we put it where there is really no houses. On some of the other ones it is right off the street some people walk there, some people park, some people drive to their own individual mailbox. We were keeping it straight.

Chairman Ouimet commented: However you ultimately choose to do it we are going to need to see it.

Mr. Abele commented: That is no problem.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Is that something that we have been looking at in the past? We are going to have to start looking at it now.

Mr. Higgins commented: Also on the adjoining neighbors on Betts Lane they just came in recently for some subdivisions and I asked them about that and according to your map it looks like part of the barn is on your property because we specifically asked them about access to the road in fact the gentlemen that was doing the presentation didn't even know there was a development going in. We mentioned it to him when he came back he said he had checked into it. You really don't show where their access is onto Betts Lane.

Mr. Abele commented: Who is the owner and what is the parcel?

Mr. Higgins commented: It is this parcel here they were just in within the last couple of months and they did a bunch of subdivisions.

Mr. Vuillaume commented: We will have into the plan because we are going to be doing some improvements to the road in there and the improvements that we are going to do to the road isn't going to be affected by what they are proposing. We will take a look at it.

Mr. Higgins commented: The one house is fairly close we even mentioned that to him the fact that the road was going to be widened and he was unaware of all of that.

Chairman Ouimet commented: The other thing that I would ask is that you have a conversation with the Fire Chief, Halfmoon - Waterford and see what he wants with respect to the enclosure that he is proposing for the storm water management area.

Mr. Higgins commented: Contact John Pingelski make sure that eliminating one cul-de-sac is sufficient for him. He said in the past that he doesn't like them at all.

Chairman Ouimet commented: We will get there.

Mr. Nadeau commented: What is this common open space on the Hayner Road area? What will that be used for?

Mr. Abele commented: It will probably part of the HOA common area green space because we will have HOA just like we have had in Sheldon Hills and Glen Meadow and it will be owned and maintained by the HOA. You are referring to the land coming in off of Hayner Road over and above the 60' for the Town Road.

Mr. Nadeau commented: It is 2.3 acres.

Mr. Abele commented: We have actually done buffering on the property to the south the Gorskey we planted a lot of trees up there already.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Is there anything else? Are there any other questions?

Mrs. Sautter commented: You told us to keep in mind that the difference would be if he did a traditional it was 132 as opposed to 206 but what you're not taking into consideration is the 90 duplexes so although the footprint might be smaller the amount of people, traffic, and cars is something that I am worried about and I think that other people will speak out about that. Instead of 74-unit increase if it was just a residential subdivision.

Mr. Abele commented: No that is unit increase. We would count for 2-units per duplex building.

Mrs. Sautter commented: That is a 74-unit increase. I didn't know because you said 206-units total including duplexes.

Mr. Higgins commented: In essence you only have 45 duplexes.

Mrs. Sautter commented: Here is says 92-family.

Mr. Abele commented: That is 90-units plus the 126 homes.

Mrs. Sautter commented: So it is 45 duplexes. Thank you for clarifying that.

Mr. Abele commented: You are welcome.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Ok thank you very much.

Mr. Higgins made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Berkowitz. Motion was carried.

Respectively submitted by Denise Mikol, Secretary
Town of Halfmoon Planning Board