

Town of Halfmoon Planning Board

October 24, 2011 Minutes

Those present at the October 24, 2011 Planning Board meeting were:

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

Senior Planner: Jeff Williams

Town Attorney: Lyn Murphy
Deputy Town Attorney: Matt Chauvin

Town Board Liaisons: Paul Hotaling
Walt Polak

CHA Representative: Mike Bianchino

Mr. Watts opened the October 24, 2011 Planning Board Meeting at 7:00 pm. Mr. Watts asked the Planning Board Members if they had reviewed the October 11, 2011 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the October 11, 2011 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried.

Public Hearings:

08.038 PH Swatling Falls PDD, 162 Upper Newtown Road – Major Subdivision/PDD

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. Jason Dell, of Lansing Engineering, stated the following: I'm here tonight to discuss the Swatling Falls Planned Development District (PDD). The parcel is approximately 94.79-acres and it is located along Upper Newtown Road on the western side. The project would be accessed by 2 points off of Upper Newtown Road. On the northern portion of the site, the road would come in off of Upper Newtown and will access approximately 10 twin home lots, which would total 20-units. Each one of those units would have a minimum of 10,000 SF per unit and the overall lots there for the twin homes have an average size of approximately 22,000 SF. To the south there would be another entrance in the central portion of the site, which would access the carriage home portion. So, the twin home units would be on the northern side of the project and the central portion of the project would have an entrance road off of Upper Newtown Road where there would be more carriage style single-family homes. The average size lot for the carriage homes is approximately 13,000 SF and this would transition down into a more traditional home type neighborhood where the average lot size would be approximately 14,700 SF. The project would be serviced by municipal water service, which would come off of Upper Newtown Road. Sanitary sewer service would be provided by a gravity

sewer down to a central pump station, which would then pump across to Route 236 and enter into the Saratoga County Sewer District (SCSD#1) system. Stormwater would be managed on-site via several stormwater management basins located throughout the project. We're here tonight to answer any additional questions that the public may have and to ask the Board to grant preliminary approval. Mr. Watts asked if anyone from the public wished to speak. Mrs. Heather Fischer, of 174 Upper Newtown Road, stated the following: I have no problems with this development. I would like to have a berm placed to buffer my home/property. Mr. Dell stated Mrs. Fischer's home would be approximately 250 FT away from this project. Mrs. Fischer stated the following: One request that I have for the developer is that this site has been dumped on for over 100 years. I have no recollection of any garbage removal service and from speaking with the Swatling's, I know there is a lot of waste, such as; lead acid batteries and some other things on the property that I would like to make sure is disposed of properly and not necessarily just kind of glossed over with some fill. That is one of my main concerns from the developer standpoint is just to make sure that this site is taken care of properly. There are also some oil barrels and things. I know that a couple of years ago there were dump trucks that did take some things out, but this is one of my main concerns. If I see it being developed and there are no dump trucks taking stuff out, then I will know that it wasn't taken care of. Mr. Dell stated the following: We can certainly look into accommodating a berm between Mrs. Fischer's property and the back of the house. I'm certain that the contractors will look to find any batteries or any empty oil barrels that are out there and they will dispose of them properly. Mr. Watts closed the Public Hearing at 7:08 pm. Mr. Ouimet asked do we know who the developer is? Mr. Dell stated Mr. Lou Lecce. Mr. Ouimet stated I have a question on the request for a berm; is it going to be accommodated or is it going to be looked into and how are we going to know if it's accommodated or not? Mr. Dell stated we can certainly work with CHA and if it is engineeringly possible, we can certainly accommodate a berm very easily. Mr. Williams stated the following: The next step would be preliminary approval and they would have to come back before the Board for final approval and you would have another chance to take a look at it. Mr. Watts stated the following: I have the same concern and I understand your position of looking into it. But, I think that is a very legitimate concern when somebody is concerned with lights shining onto their property and I'll go along with that concern myself. Also, the environmental concerns have to be followed and asked Mr. Dell if he understood what you can't do and what you can't dispose of. Mr. Dell stated yes. Mr. Watts stated I think the fines are rather substantial from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) if any of those things are left in places where they shouldn't be or plowed under. Mr. Dell stated I understand.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to grant preliminary approval for the Swatling Falls Major Subdivision/PDD and asked the applicant to consider a berm to buffer the neighbor at 174 Upper Newtown Road and that all hazardous waste from the farm operation be disposed of properly. Mr. Ruchlicki seconded. Motion carried.

11.073 PH Thomas Bethel Family Trust Subdivision, Plank Road – Major Subdivision

Mr. Watts opened the Public Hearing at 7:10 pm. Mr. Watts asked if anyone would like to have the public notice read. No one responded. Mr. Duane Rabideau, of Gilbert VanGuilder Land Surveyor, PLLC, stated the following: I'm representing Mr. Dave Canfield in his request for a 4-lot subdivision for the Subdivision of Lands of the Bethel Family Trust. The project is located on the east side of Plank Road about 250 FT south of Stone Quarry Road. We are requesting a 4-lot subdivision. The first lot is already an approved lot from a previous subdivision and basically we are just doing a lot line adjustment to this lot and we would be creating 3 new lots. We are creating Lot #2, #3 and #4 and these lots would meet all of the minimum requirements for the zone. These 4-lots would

be tied into public water and public sewer that would run down the eastside of Plank Road and tie into the Rivercrest Subdivision down at Captains Boulevard. We have addressed all comments from CHA and we have an historical sign-off. Mr. Watts asked if anyone from the public wished to speak. Mr. Anthony Gatto stated the following: I reside on Captains Boulevard and I recently faxed you a letter. Mr. Watts stated yes, I have it.

(For the record: Mr. Gatto's letter --- See below attachment #1)

Attachment #1
Page 1 of 2

From: unknown Page: 1/2 Date: 10/19/2011 12:54:06 PM

S. Anthony Gatto, Esq.
9 Captains Blvd
Waterford, NY 12188
518-588-1084

RECEIVED
OCT 20 2011

TOWN OF HALFMOON
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
RECEIVED
OCT 19 2011
TOWN OF HALFMOON
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

October 19, 2011

VIA Facsimile 518-371-0936

Steve Watts, Chairman
Town of Halfmoon Planning Board
Halfmoon Town Hall
2 Halfmoon Town Plaza
Halfmoon, NY 12065

re: October 24, 2011 Planning Board Meeting

Dear Mr. Watts,

I reside at 9 Captains Blvd. in the Town of Halfmoon and am writing this letter in order to communicate my concern over a proposed subdivision discussed at your June 27, 2011 meeting as well as subsequent meetings. The proposed subdivision was referred to in the Board minutes as "11.073 NB Thomas Bethel Family Trust Subdivision, Plank Road - Minor Subdivision" although it is now being referred to as a "major subdivision". I am aware this issue will be addressed at the October 24, 2011 meeting of the Planning Board and at this time, I will be unable to attend the meeting to voice my concerns.

Captains Blvd borders the proposed subdivision. My primary concern relates to the issue of sewer/septic that would be required for the aforementioned lots. There was some discussion at the Planning Board meeting concerning the possibility of a septic system in the event a tie-in to the public sewer was not approved and/or possible.

As you know, Halfmoon lies within the watershed of both the Hudson and Mohawk Rivers. The proposed subdivision lies directly in the Mohawk River watershed (although there has been no action on behalf of the Department of Environmental Conservation to promulgate any rules or regulations to designate and protect the same). Those properties on Captains Blvd that border the proposed subdivision have a drainage easement running through every backyard. The drainage easement flows from the higher numbered homes to the rear of 1 Captains Blvd. The presence of water within the drainage easement occurs not only seasonally, but also with regular rainstorms and often causes the properties at 1 and 3 Captains Blvd to have large pools of standing water in the backyard. As such, the drainage easement may be considered a "watercourse" pursuant to New York State Code, Rules and Regulations (NYCRR), Title 10, Appendix 75-A.4 which would require at least a 100 foot distance between any leach field and the drainage easement. It should also be noted that most, if not all of the ground in this area sits atop clay with only a small amount of soil covering the clay. Clay is not a suitable substance for drainage and any leach field drainage would drain on top of the clay flowing towards the Captains Blvd properties and ultimately draining into the backyards. Furthermore, the boundary with the proposed subdivision consists of a "hill" whose top is about six (6) feet or greater from the drainage

Page 2 of 2

From: unknown Page: 2/2 Date: 10/19/2011 12:54:06 PM

easement and the other parts of the backyards. It should also be noted that all the lots in the current and proposed subdivision are uphill from Captains Blvd and the natural flow of water from those lots is downhill to the Captains Blvd properties.

New York State Code, Rules and Regulations (NYCRR), Title 10, Appendix 75-A.3 requires a minimum design flow of 110 to 150 gallons per day, per bedroom. Depending on the final approval of the subdivision, this could result in an additional 1,350 gallons or more of extra water flowing downhill to the Captains Blvd properties. It should also be noted that the water table in this area is extremely high as evidenced by the pond on the corner of Plank Road and Stone Quarry Road as well as the drainage area on the corners of Stone Quarry Rd and Brigantine Dr (as well as the lot that was cleared on Stone Quarry between Plank Rd and Brigantine Dr that was almost underwater over this past weekend) making the placement of a septic system questionable at best. Of course, it goes without saying that a high water table has the potential to flood a septic system thereby causing waste to flow downhill to Captains Blvd. In the past three months, there has been enough rainfall and standing water on the subject property to have caused any septic system/leach field to have overflowed thereby causing the waste of such systems to have drained into the drainage easement and making the backyards of the homes on Captains Blvd a significant health hazard.

The placement of a septic system/leach field on these lots would significantly harm the quiet enjoyment of all homes abutting the proposed subdivision and current lots. By copy of this letter, I am strongly opposing any use of a septic system/leach field for any of the lots (whether the subdivision is approved or not) and am putting all parties on notice of my objection. Not only would such approval have the potential to damage my property, it would also have the potential to infringe on my right to quiet enjoyment of my property which I will defend through the filing of a legal action if needed.

Regards,


S. Anthony Gatto, Esq.

(End of Attachment #1)

Mr. Gatto stated the following: My only issue with the sewer line going down to Rivercrest was that before this Board in 2007 when another proposed property was going in here, the individual, Ms. Devito on Stone Quarry Road commented that she tried to get tied into that sewer system and was told that she could not because Rivercrest was at full capacity. I want to know if that situation has been remedied to accommodate these properties? This was in the Planning Board minutes on September 24, 2007. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Jim DiPasquale of the SCS# if the system was upgraded at Rivercrest to accept this access. Mr. DiPasquale stated I'm not aware of any upgrades. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Bianchino if he was aware of the upgrades. Mr. Bianchino stated I'm not aware of anything that has been done there and I'm not sure if Mr. Rabideau has gotten any feedback from the County Sewer District at this point. Mr. Rabideau stated I believe we have received feedback because we wouldn't be able to tie-in if Saratoga County didn't say we have the capacity to tie-in. Mr. Watts asked for the 3 houses? Mr. Rabideau stated for the 4 houses. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Gatto if he had spoken to somebody else? Mr. Gatto stated the following: No, this was in the minutes before this Board on September 24, 2007 where Ms. Devito commented that they were trying to tie-in and I believe she is one of the first two houses on Stone Quarry Road across from the pond. The Devito's tried to tie into that sewer line to get down to Rivercrest and they were told that they couldn't because the Rivercrest sewers were at capacity. Mr. Watts stated we will have to look at those minutes. Mr. Gatto stated the following: So, I would recommend that the Board not take any action until it's reviewed. Mr. Polak stated at that time there was no sewer near the Devito property. Mrs. Murphy stated the following: Regardless and just so you are aware, and I'm not giving you legal advice, I'm just advising you that what is before the Board right now is to subdivide the property into the 4 different lots. It's not to permit the building, they'll have to go through the Building Department in order to do that and part of that process would be for them to prove that there is capacity and that they are allowed. Also, they know that they are proceeding at their own risk. Mr. Gatto stated I'm a real estate attorney, so I understand. Mr. Polak stated I can't see the Town saying that the sewer was at capacity because the Town alone is not involved in the sewer business. Mr. Williams stated the following: The proposed lot areas that are being proposed right now only conform to single-family homes with sewer and water being provided. So, they would not be able to construct on these lots with a septic system because they don't meet our minimum lot areas. Mr. Eric West asked is the sewer going to be gravity feed from the corner down into Captains Boulevard? Mr. Rabideau stated yes. Mr. West asked is the water coming from Captains Boulevard and not up near Stone Quarry Road? Mr. Rabideau stated that is correct. Mr. West stated so you would be extending the water line all the way up to there. Mr. Rabideau stated that is correct. Mr. West asked is there going to be a fire hydrant or anything at the end of the line? Mr. Rabideau stated yes. Mr. Watts closed the Public Hearing at 7:18 pm. Mr. Nadeau asked is there accessibility for neighbors if they want to tie into that water line? Mr. Rabideau stated it ends at a certain location and it would be just a matter of extending it or possibly running a lateral. Mr. Nadeau asked how about the houses across from there? Mr. Rabideau stated yes, they would be able to bore under the road and tie into it. Mr. Watts stated and that would be done at their expense. Mr. Rabideau stated that's correct. Mr. Nadeau stated but they will have that option.

Mr. Nadeau made a motion to approve the major subdivision application for the Thomas Bethel Family Trust. Mr. Roberts seconded. Motion carried.

11.115 PH Loomis Lot Line Adjustment, Harris Road/Lape Road – Minor Subdivision

Mr. Watts opened the Public Hearing at 7:19 pm. Mr. Watts asked if anyone would like to have the public notice read. No one responded. Mr. Duane Rabideau, of Gilbert VanGuilder Land Surveyor,

PLLC, stated the following: I'm here tonight representing Takwai Realty Group LLC for a lot line adjustment between Lots 3 and 4 of the Loomis Subdivision. This parcel is located at the corner of Lape Road and Harris Road. These 2 lots are part of a 4-lot subdivision that was approved last year. This lot line adjustment would be to create a better building envelop for Lot #4. By doing this we push the common drive up a little bit farther by about 50 FT so we would be increasing the sight distance by about 50 FT. The configuration of these 2 lots would be a better lot layout because now Lot #3 does not have to have a sewer easement to cross into Lot #4 to tie into the proposed sewer. Mr. Watts asked if anyone from the public wished to speak. Mr. James Bold, of 105 Harris Road, stated the following: At the last public hearing I brought forth a request to have the opportunity to go in and take some photographs of some of the historic structures in there. As a results of that, Mr. Rabideau was very cooperative and he facilitated an opportunity for me to speak with Mr. Zee, the representative of the owners. So, we did in fact go in there. Mr. David Wiltsey, who is here tonight, Mr. George Hansen, the Chairman of the Zoning Board and myself went in with a generator and a long lead cord, shop lights and a camera and we were able to take some pretty nice photographs. We captured several of the historic features of that older home. The home is in tough shape; the roof is gone and it's a hardhat area. I just want to thank the Board for your support and cooperation in that matter and I appreciate that. Mr. Watts stated thanks for your hard work Mr. Bold. Mr. John Xu, of 7 Sprucewood Court, stated are you going to build multi-family homes or single-family homes? Mr. Rabideau stated more than likely it's going to be a single-family and duplexes. Mr. Xu stated the following: The reason why I asked is because in the past couple of years there was a two-family house next to mine where the builder had to mow the lawn because he could not sell the multi-family house. He also had to shovel the snow and had to do a lot of maintenance on this home himself because he could not sell the home. He cannot enjoy his life because of all the upkeep he had to do at that property because people come and go. Our property cannot increase in value because of this so we also lose. The builder loses as well because he is not taking in money. A single-family will sell better and increase the tax revenue for the Town. A two-family home would be a lose-lose situation for everybody. My suggestion is to build single-family homes as a better answer. Ms. Nora Cerniglia, of 1 Sprucewood Court, stated the following: I was here for the original subdivision of this property and our concern was when they put in the waterlines or gas lines along Harris Road what was that going to do our property. We maintain our property and it is part of our lawn care service and we count that property in and we take care of it. Right now it looks very nice and I just want to be assured that they will return the property to its original condition and that they are not going to infringe on our property at all. I also would rather see single-family homes there and I'm not in favor of duplexes there because this would be right in my back yard. Mr. Rabideau stated there might be a possibility that the homes could be single-family because it's not cast in stone. Mr. Watts asked was there another statement made by the Cerniglia's about restoring the property to its original state? Mr. Rabideau stated yes, that statement was made at the last public hearing. Mr. Watts asked so are you going to do that? Mr. Rabideau stated yes. Mr. Watts closed the Public Hearing at 7:25 pm. Mr. Higgins stated I asked this question at the previous public hearing; now you have to put in water, sewer and gas all in that easement or the right-of-way along Harris Road, correct? Mr. Rabideau stated that is correct. Mr. Higgins stated the following: With the separations that you are required legally between water, sewer and gas; I questioned whether or not you could get that in there and you assured us that you could. I just want to go on record again that the work you are entitled to do is strictly within the right-of-way and you are not to infringe on private problem. Mr. Rabideau stated the following: That is correct, because in one area the right-of-way is actually wider than the standard 50 FT right-of-way for roads. That is a County road and they took extra takings to get around that hill so there is plenty room to meet all the requirements for separation and to stay in the right-of-way. Mr. Higgins stated okay and asked if everything else from the

original approval would stay the same including the 20 FT no-cut buffer between the proposed lots and the existing lots on Sprucewood Court? Mr. Rabideau stated yes, that is correct.

Mr. Nadeau made a motion to approve the minor subdivision application for the Loomis Lot Line Adjustment condition on all prior stipulations from the original 2008 approval being adhered to and that any disturbance to 1 Sprucewood Court is restored to its original condition. Mr. Roberts seconded. Motion carried.

New Business:

11.110 NB Vending Property LLC (Scott Earl), 4 Enterprise Ave. – Commercial Site Plan

Mr. Jason Dell, of Lansing Engineering, stated the following: I'm here on behalf of Mr. Scott Earl and Vending Property LLC for the Lot 4 Halfmoon Industrial Park building expansion. The existing property is approximately 10.89-acres located 4 Enterprise Avenue. The existing building on Enterprise is approximately 16,000 SF and the building is currently being retrofitted and the internal is being revised to approximately 12,000 SF of warehouse and 4,000 SF of office space. The proposed building expansion would happen on the western side of the existing building that is there right now. The applicant proposes to construct a 14,400 SF (120 FT x 120 FT) addition to the southwest side of the existing 16,000 SF building. The existing water service would be utilized to service both the existing building and the proposed expansion. The sanitary sewer service would have to be revised a little to provide a grease trap for the kitchen facility and run a new sanitary sewer line around to connect into the existing line that is presently there. With the existing 16,000 SF building and the proposed 14,400 SF addition; so, with combining the two buildings together we would have a total office space of approximately 4,000 SF, which would require 20 parking spaces to accommodate that for the zoning. For both buildings combined, we have a total warehouse space of 15,440 SF, which would require approximately 32 parking spaces for the warehouse. Within the proposed building expansion there is going to be kitchen facilities that are going to be used to supply the vending operations. The kitchen facilities would require approximately 24 parking spaces. As the business grows and as the expansion proceeds, they anticipate a total of 71 employees. So, we derived a total number of parking that is going to be required to be approximately 76 parking spaces. Currently for the existing building there are 57 parking spaces, so we are proposing to bank 19 parking spaces along the western side of the property in case they are ever needed for the facility. The proposed building expansion would also have a loading dock on the western side, which would have a recessed area down to the loading dock as well as some canopies that would be installed on the front of the building to accommodate the vending operations and the movement of the food in and out of the building. Right now we are proposing a stormwater management swale on the outside of the western edge that would accommodate any drainage off the side before it can get down to the low area in the creek. We are here tonight to answer any questions you may have and to move the project forward however the Board sees fit. Mr. Roberts asked if there would be any food preparation at this location. Mr. Scott Earl, the applicant and owner of Prestige Services, stated the following: Yes there will be. We came in six months ago for the change of tenant use for the existing building to move Prestige Services (a vending company), which is located in Clifton Park, over here and we said at that time that we would propose an expansion to include a brand new state-of-the-art kitchen; including what they call a cook and chill program to accommodate all of the Meals on Wheels programs that we service in the state. We are here for an expansion to the existing warehouse to provide for a freezer 20 x 40, a cooler 20 x 40 exterior freezer and a 10,900 SF state-of-the-art kitchen and employing all the people to prepare those meals. Our business is: we support all of the area schools and we run the cafeterias at all the charter schools, Catholic Central High School, Lansingburgh Schools and Meals

on Wheels for 7 counties and very soon the addition of Rensselaer County. All of the food would be prepared in that kitchen and shipped every day. Our shipping and traffic needs are very simple. Our vending operation is off the dock by 6:30 am and we have 12 vending trucks that go out to various locations and they spend the day. Our Meals on Wheels program starts leaving 8:30-9:00 am to get to all of the congregant sites to finalize the meals for lunch and delivery services are at various times throughout the day. Mrs. Murphy stated I believe when the applicant was originally here just to move into this space that exists, there was going to be no creation; now he's expanding what already exists. Mr. Watts stated what is the total number of employees that would be added. Mr. Earl stated the potential is 71 and currently we're at a level of 30, so there would be 41 additional employees. Those jobs would be relocated from Clifton Park. However, we are closing kitchens in Ulster County, Rensselaer County and Montgomery County. All of those jobs would be relocated to Halfmoon. Relocated meaning; those folks would be offered job but more than likely those jobs are of a medium pay scale and we'll probably just hire from within. Mr. Watts stated the following: That is a great addition for the businesses and employment opportunities for people in the Town of Halfmoon and it's surroundings. When I see the troubles other municipalities are having with their budgets, their finances and tax revenues, it's easy to see why people want to locate in Halfmoon, buy homes here and live in this community. Mr. Earl stated we are not asking for any IDA Funding, we are not asking for tax breaks and we'll willing to pay our full fare share of everything. Mr. Ruchlicki asked how many of the 71 people are actually going to be preparing food there? Mr. Earl stated 20 to 25 people. Mr. Ruchlicki stated because I'm assuming that part of that is going to be people who are delivering the food. Mr. Earl stated the following: Yes that is correct. The people that deliver the food come in about 8:00-8:30 am in the morning. Mr. Higgins asked what size are the parking spots because I don't see anything that says they are 10 FT x 20 FT? Mr. Dell stated the parking spaces would be 10 FT x 20 FT. Mr. Higgins stated if you could, please make a note on the drawings to that affect. Mr. Watts stated if these are long-term employee parking spots, I try to eliminate as much black top as we can by utilizing landbanking. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Williams what is the acceptable parking spot size for employee spaces? Mr. Williams stated 9 FT x 20 FT would be acceptable for employee parking. Mr. Earl stated the following: I appreciate that but I share the same concern as Mr. Higgins. In every building that I ever created, I've gone with 10 FT x 20 FT. I would prefer to maintain all 10 FT x 20 FT spaces to avoid any problems with customers/employees dinging each other's doors and I don't want to file claim forms and I would rather have enough space to open up the car doors. Mr. Watts stated we could do it and could cut it back if you want, but if you don't, that's fine too. Mr. Higgins asked regarding the proposed walk-in cooler, would that be a pre-manufactured cooler that just sits on a pad? Mr. Earl stated yes, that is correct. Mr. Higgins stated so it would be like galvanized or stainless steel? Mr. Earl stated the following: It would have an aluminum exterior with a foam interior. Underneath the floor has to be created special. A cooler is allowed to have standard concrete and the freezer type has to have a special floor that is made of insulated aluminum. Mr. Nadeau stated regarding the Philo property and that crushed stone area, is that an encroachment on the south side of the your property? Mr. Dell stated yes. Mr. Watts stated we have a commercial site plan application, and asked Mr. Williams if this was a change of tenant application? Mr. Williams stated no, it should be an addition to site plan application. Mr. Watts stated the application doesn't show here what State agencies you have to go so, we will have to look at that.

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

11.117 NB Chris' Consignment Thrift Shop, 429 Route 146 – Change of Tenant & Sign

Ms. Christine Franceschi, the applicant, stated the following: I'm before the Board tonight for a change of tenant and sign application at 429 Route 146. I'm proposing a consignment/thrift shop. It would basically be just myself and I would be running the shop full-time. It would be a small store and I plan on doing more volume and more turn over. I believe in doing something more of everyday items for everyday people instead of what the other thrift stores do in the area who exclusively do brand name items. So, we do not have a strict basic consignment shop in the area. I do have a waiting list from people who are very interested in consigning every day goods. I would not have large furniture and it would be basically household clothing, baby clothes, toys and things like that. Mr. Nadeau asked would there be any outside storage or outside display of items? Ms. Franceschi stated no. Mr. Higgins asked what would be your hours of operation? Ms. Franceschi stated right now I'm trying to follow the same hours as the beauty saloon that is located on the same lot, which is a Tuesday through Saturday operation that would be approximately 10:00 am to 6:00 pm. Mr. Higgins asked is there running water and sanitary facilities at that location. Ms. Franceschi stated the following: Yes there is. There is a bathroom but there are no kitchen facilities. Mr. Ouimet stated can you tell me how your operation is going to run and how long these articles are going to stay in your shop for sale and what are you going to do with those articles after that period of time elapses. Ms. Franceschi stated the following: In my letter of intent to the Board I stated that the proposal is for a basic consignment store. I would utilize what is really the norm for a consignment; taking in articles, pricing for a standard thrift store rate or what you would see maybe on Craig's List. I would be doing research on something that might be a little more expensive but not brand names. I have had to turn away people looking to bring in crystal because that is not what I would be looking to sell there. I would look for people who are having hardships. I would be pricing the inventory that people bring in. I do have a program that I have up and running that is called Best Consignments. There is a program that does all the price adjustments and after 30 days it automatically reduces it in half and we reduce it in half again up to 90 days. At the time that I do bring in articles, it would be decided at that point if the people want the articles returned or donated. I do strong work with Noah's Playground in Ballston Spa and I actively donate to them most frequently. I also donate to Captain's Treasures and the Thrift Shop on Route 9. I also have people that are moving out and they call me and say they don't want things but we don't want to throw them out and they ask me if I could take care of that for them. People just don't take the time to donate things. So, maybe if they are offered a little bit of money for their articles they would be more apt to bring things in if they get some of their money back. Noah's Playground in Ballston Spa specifically works with the indigent of Saratoga County. You will see a lot of people from the Department of Social Services (DSS) go right there right after they stop at social services. Mr. Ouimet asked so you feel confident that you have a plan for disposal of articles that are unwanted after 90 days. Ms. Franceschi stated yes, I will only take in undamaged items and I do test all items as they come in. Mr. Ouimet stated the following: I'm concerned that you'll become a place of clutter; in other words, you'll end up storing a lot of articles that you just can't sell and can't donate because the organizations are particular as to what they take and what they don't take these days. Just because you have something that you think would be attractive to somebody, sometimes they don't take it. So, the question is what happens because we need to be somewhat satisfied that you have a good plan in place to move the items out so your place doesn't become cluttered and it is located right on Route 146. Ms. Franceschi stated the following: I will not let it become cluttered simply because I just don't have the space and I don't have storage on the property. Maybe in a year or two I may come back to the Board and ask if we can build onto the property but that's not what I'm doing now. I only have 600 SF of space and I'm going to be

maximizing the space that's in there. I'm not, by any means, a hoarder and it's not going to become like that. I will be pre-approving items before they go into the shop. I don't know if you have ever been in Clifton Park during their large trash days and see what people are throwing out. It's really a sin because people need these items. Knowing the thrift stores and having been a single mom for the past 16 years, I know the people in the thrift stores and I'm a thrift store shopper myself. So I know what the local thrift stores want and I know what they take. I have already spoken with the thrift stores and asked what they take or what they would want. So, I'm not going to be consuming anything up and beyond what I know is already available in additional thrift stores. To be honest, I'm giving things a better chance of being reused than what is currently being done now where people are just throwing things out and it's really filling up the landfills. Mr. Nadeau asked would there be any situations where a customer would leave these items at your front door when you are now open? Ms. Franceschi stated no, I have a contract, appointments need to be made and people have already shown interest. Mr. Nadeau stated again, so there would be no drop off where people could leave items and things would not be stored outside. Ms. Franceschi stated that is correct. Mr. Watts stated the following: We have had issues in certain places and even though some charities are well intentioned in the area. But there are some places that really don't look very nice. The general public may be the worst with throwing things over a fence and leaving things outside and that's why we're being careful. Mr. Roberts stated the following: This proposed sign would replace what is already up there now. The sign would be one-sided, internally lit, located on the south elevation of the separate building and the sign dimensions would be 2 FT x 4 FT for a total of 8 SF. Mr. Watts asked the applicant to advertise that they are located in Halfmoon.

Mr. Nadeau made a motion to approve the change of tenant application for Chris' Consignment Thrift Shop condition on no outside display of merchandise and no outside "drop offs". Mr. Ruchlicki seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the sign application for Chris' Consignment Thrift Shop. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

11.119 NB The House of Kitchens & More, LLC, 1707 Route 9 (Shoppes of Halfmoon) – Change of Tenant & Sign

Mr. Bruce Tanski, the applicant, stated the following: The House of Kitchens stated in business in 1955. They would not be purchasing the property. The gentleman who owns this is Mr. Mike Marcinowski and the gentleman that purchased the business is Mr. Steve Jackoski. They basically do custom cabinets, baths, fireplaces for libraries, entertainment centers, bars and appliances. The cabinets are generally sent from the fabricator or manufacturer to the job site or warehouse. They have a warehouse in northern Saratoga County for temporary storage. They will not be receiving large quantities of shipments at the store. Almost everything is custom ordered and shipped. The showroom would be open from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Saturday by appointments. There would only be one employee. Mr. Jackoski also has a place in Queensbury and he also owns Kitchen Dimensions in Saratoga, which is a high-end cabinet shop. They would be occupying approximately 2,000 SF so it would be a very low volume traffic place of business. Mr. Nadeau asked would they have any large trucks or anything parking in front of the location? Mr. Tanski stated I wouldn't allow that. Mr. Ouimet asked would they have any outside sales with a display of merchandise on the sidewalk or anything like that? Mr. Tanski stated no I wouldn't allow that either. Mr. Ouimet asked how about banners? Mr. Tanski stated all the signs at the shopping center would be 2 FT wide by 8 FT long and we did all of that with the original concept with the shopping center. Mr. Nadeau stated I think the square footage was pre-approved but not the sign.

Mr. Tanski stated because we made them all the same and that was the intent that they would all be 2 FT x 8 FT with a brown frame and it would say "The House of Kitchens". Mr. Roberts stated but we still have to see that. Mrs. Murphy stated that is correct.

Mr. Ouimet made a motion to approve the change of tenant application for The House of Kitchens & More, LLC condition on no outside display of merchandise. Mr. Higgins seconded. Motion carried.

11.120 NB Dormie Avenue Lot Line Adjustment, 16 & 18 Dormie Avenue – Major Subdivision

Mr. Roberts recused himself from this item. Mr. Duane Rabideau, of Gilbert VanGuilder Land Surveyor, PLLC, stated the following: I'm here tonight representing the Fairways of Halfmoon, LLC for a lot line adjustment for Lot #16 and Lot #18 Dormie Avenue. Lot #16 would be for a single-family house and Lot #18 at this point in time is an existing retention basin. So, this lot line adjustment would keep all of the retention basin on Lot #18 and would create a building lot for Lot #16. The grading for Lot #16 would match what is going to be approved for Phase III of Fairway Meadows. Mr. Higgins asked did you say Lot #18 is a stormwater retention area? Mr. Rabideau stated the following: That is correct. Lot #18 was originally approved for a single-family house but apparently they moved the retention basin onto this lot. It was going to be in Phase III but for some reason they moved it over here and it was constructed. Mr. Higgins asked is there anything on Lot #16 or is it an empty lot right now? Mr. Rabideau stated the following: Lot #16 is an empty lot. We needed to get this adjusted because Mr. Tanski wants to build on this lot and right now it is approved and we need to get it down to one lot so we're not selling a portion of a lot and it would meet all our standards. Mr. Williams asked Mr. Tanski has the road and the stormwater retention basin been dedicated to the Town? Mr. Tanski stated yes, Dormie Avenue has been dedicated to the Town. Mr. Bianchino stated the stormwater retention basin has not been dedicated to the Town and we can take care of that as part of Phase III. Mr. Tanski stated yes.

Mr. Nadeau made a motion to set a public hearing for the November 14, 2011 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Higgins seconded. Motion carried.

11.121 NB Halfmoon Plaza, 1509 Route 9 – Sign

Mr. Tom Wheeler, of A J Signs, stated the following: I here tonight representing Halfmoon Plaza for their sign proposals. I will begin with the freestanding sign. We are trying to utilize the structure that is currently there. The current freestanding sign has four concrete posts with steel beams imbedded in them and that's why the sign is basically a rectangle. The north/south faces will be internally illuminated with individual tenant panels for easy changes. The east/west faces is basically just an aluminum box that would have the appearance of a raised panel and we would put the address up there and that is not internally lit. The reason we have the east/west faces as big as they are is because there are four concrete posts there that we are trying to use. Mr. Roberts asked if there would be any exposed neon in your lighting? Mr. Wheeler stated no, it is not exposed neon; it is poly carbon faces with fluorescent tubes inside. Also, Glennpeters Jewelers wishes to place a wall sign on the south elevation of the existing plaza. There is a Glennpeters sign currently located in Colonie and they would like to place that sign on the side of the building. The Glennpeter sign would be lit with floodlights. Mr. Roberts stated please make sure that the floodlights do not shine out towards Route 9 and that there is no glare. Mr. Wheeler stated okay.

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

Sign #1--Freestanding

Sign Size: 3.5 ft x 15 ft (top plaza sign) & 10 ft x 14.1 ft (tenant panels)

Sign Area: 194.5 X 2 = 389 SF

Total Height: 16 ft

Sided: one-sided Two-sided

Location of Sign: in front of plaza –same location as existing freestanding sign

Lighted: Internal Flood

Sign #2-Glennpeter's wall sign

Sign Size: 3 ft x 10 ft

Sign Area: 30 SF

Sided: one-sided Two-sided

Location of Sign: south elevation of plaza building

Lighted: Internal Flood

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the sign application for the freestanding sign for Halfmoon Plaza condition on no exposed neon and that the floodlights do not shine in the roadway. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the sign application for the wall-mounted sign for Glennpeter Jewelers condition on no exposed neon and that the floodlights do not shine in the roadway. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

11.122 NB 6 Liebich Lane, Liebich Lane – Concept-Commercial Site Plan

Mr. Gavin Vuillaume, of the Environmental Design Partnership, stated the following: I'm here tonight representing the applicant who is Liebich Lane One, LLC. This project proposes to construct a 60,000 SF office/warehouse building on approximately 7-acres within the Rolling Hills Planned Development District (PDD). Recently we received the approval for RGH Industries and they have been under construction and subsequently they are now occupying that building. I think they have about 40 to 50 people working there and everything has gone well as far as the construction and its occupancy. I have maps of the overall site in general. I have a map of the Rolling Hills PDD and this was the actual map that was approved for the PDD proposal. As part of that approval, there were approximately 139 homes approved along with approximately 600,000 SF of Light Industrial land usage. With the introduction of the RGH building, we're now starting to gather momentum. I guess the old proverb of "build it and they shall come" may have some truth. Again, this is the original map that was approved and I also have an aerial shot of the entire site as it sits today. It doesn't really reflect the construction that has just occurred but you can get a feel for at least the Light Industrial section of the PDD. The Light Industrial section is about 112-acres and as you can see, it is sort of bisected by Liebich Lane. The highlighted area in the center is where we would be proposing this 60,000 SF building. When we did our original design, in order to make sure that we had enough room for some of the other lots around it, we have put some future development on the lot adjacent to the RGH building. So, you can see how the buildings will start to appear along Liebich Lane. One of the agreements at the Planning Board when we did get our approvals was that Liebich Lane would be paved by the end of the year. I spoke with Mr. Valente this afternoon and they are still under construction but they are ahead of schedule. I believe it's paved all the way almost to where this new facility would be and I think they have the gravel almost half done for the rest of the road. So, with a little bit more gravel, they will be ready to pave the remaining balance of the road and we should have our road complete all the way to the end. This site is rather simple and this is the area that we looked at first and we have left this area

as future development. The main reason we're proposing this lot first is because this one is a little bit more shovel ready and there isn't as much grading that is required. The site has one primary access on Liebich Lane for visitors and employees and then there would be either a private or public road that would gain access to the rear of the site, which is where the truck traffic and the deliveries would occur. We are looking at 150 parking spaces, which is a little bit more than what's required. The breakout of the building for the 60,000 SF is probably 60% of the building would be warehouse and another 40 percent may be offices. This is what we call a flex space depending on the tenant and that may be adjusted a little bit and so would the parking. But, I think 150 parking spaces is going to be more than adequate for this type of building. The developer has done similar buildings in Colonie and Latham and they have never exceeded 150 parking spaces. So, we are comfortable with the parking on the site. We certainly would like to introduce some landbanking at some point. Our stormwater management would meet all the new green infrastructure requirements and there is municipal sewer and water on Liebich Lane. Mr. Nadeau asked is this on the north side or the south side? Mr. Vuillaume stated it is on the north side. Mr. Higgins asked what size parking spots are you proposing 9 FT x 20 FT or 10 FT x 20 FT? Mr. Vuillaume stated I think most of the parking spots in the front are all 10 FT x 20 FT and some of the ones off to the side would be a little less. The parking spots that are being used more up front would all be 10 FT x 20 FT. Mr. Higgins asked is the road being built to Town standards? Mr. Vuillaume stated yes. Mr. Higgins stated I'm referring to the access road for the trucks. Mr. Vuillaume stated that access would probably be like a shared driveway that would not be built to Town standards. The other access; if you look at the overall development of the site, you can see that it's going to begin to access this parcel, possibly another parcel and a very large area in the back so there could be some future subdivision. So, this one would be built towards Town specifications. Mr. Watts asked what kind of business is this going to be? Mr. Vuillaume stated right now we're looking at flex space so there would be multiple tenants with either warehouse or office land use. Mr. Watts stated so there isn't a principle tenant. Mr. Vuillaume stated no, not yet.

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

11.124 NB Total Benefit Management/Benefits by Design, 1520 Crescent Road - Change of Tenant

Mr. Greg Mills, the applicant, stated the followings: The building in question is 1520 Crescent Road and is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of the Northway and Crescent Road. These are two change of tenants from what was a single tenant in two separate tenant spaces. The previous tenant vacated because of some personal problems and these two tenants are replacing them. I should note that Cooper, Erving & Savage was a sub-tenant to the previous tenant so they are not truly new but they were new in the sense that they are a direct tenant of that space. Benefits by Design and Total Benefit Management are owned by the same individual. They are an insurance provider primary to the transportation industry, meaning the trucking industry. They do not have on-site service. In this location there is going to be a total of 4 employees. There would be no clients or customers service at this location. There is more than adequate parking at the site. We have 23 parking spaces and the total usage with the entire building will now be 16 of those 23 spaces. Their hours of operation would be 9:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday. The only person there on a regular basis is the office manager. So, we're requesting a change of tenant that would permit Total Benefit Management & Benefits by Design both to occupy the 1,660 SF, which is the middle tenancy or what we call suite 300.

Mr. Ruchlicki made a motion to approve the change of tenant application for Total Benefit Management/Benefits by Design. Mr. Higgins seconded. Motion carried.

11.125 NB Cooper, Erving & Savage, LLP, 1520 Crescent Road – Change of Tenant

Mr. Greg Mills, the applicant, stated the followings: Cooper, Erving and Savage are an old-old law firm from Albany that has been a sub-tenant in our building for about the last 6 years. The author, James Fenimore Cooper, is the actual founder of that firm. Cooper, Erving & Savage is primarily a real estate and business law practice. They use this location as a satellite office and they have 2 part-time and 2 full-time employees. Again, bringing the total parking usage to 16 of 23 available parking spots. There are occasions when they would have a closing on a real estate matter, which would bring in sometimes as many as 4 to 5 additional people for the purpose of a closing. Usually, that is for 1 hour on a Friday but it could occur at different times during the week. There is a sub-tenant there that is named Creative Office Systems and Eric Hornberger is the owner and manager. He has been in that building for 7 or 8 years and he would remain a sub-tenant. He has one truck that is parked on the property on a regular basis and he also parks his own vehicle there on a regular basis. But, again it would not exceed the allotted parking spaces. So, we are requesting a change of tenant from what had been Johns & Lee Real Estate Services to Cooper, Erving & Savage for suite 400. Mr. Watts asked regarding Mr. Mills' statement on "sub-tenant". Mr. Mills stated Creative Office Systems is a sub-tenant and they previously applied and were granted a change of tenant status here about 5 or 6 years ago and they are going to remain at this site. Mrs. Murphy stated don't call it a sub-tenant because in actuality it is tenant who is leasing property. Mr. Mills stated okay, I withdraw that term.

Mr. Ouimet made a motion to approve the change of tenant application for Cooper, Erving & Savage, LLP. Mr. Roberts seconded. Motion carried.

11.126 NB 1520 Crescent, LLC, 1520 Crescent Road – Sign

Mr. Greg Mills, the applicant, stated the followings: Our sign application would have no change in the dimension of the sign, no change in the top line, which is my law firm. The changes would be the second and third lines and the bottom line was always two separate names and will now accommodate the change of tenancy for Total Benefit Management/Benefits by Design and Cooper, Erving & Savage would be second tenant change. Only the lettering would change on the sign and the sign would remain as is.

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

1520 Crescent LLC, (Mills), 1520 Crescent Vischer Ferry Road, Sign

Sign Size: 96 SF

Sign Dimensions: 4 ft x 12 ft

Total Height: 7 ft

Sided: one-sided Two-sided

Location of Sign: at the entrance of the site

Lighted: Internal Flood

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the sign application for 1520 Crescent, LLC. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

11.127 NB Veyeper Realty, LLC, 1593 Route 9 (Kevin Hedley) – Addition to Site Plan

Mr. Kevin Hedley, the applicant, stated the following: I'm here to get an approval to construct a 24 FT x 24 FT garage structure in the rear of the property. Mr. Watts asked what would that garage structure be used for? Mr. Hedley stated to park 2 cars and some extra equipment such as; lawnmowers, snow blowers and that type of stuff. Mr. Ouimet asked would the access to the

proposed garage be through the parking lot? Mr. Hedley stated yes it is. Mr. Ouimet stated I noticed that you don't have anything that connects and we don't know if it's going to be a front load garage or a side load garage. Mr. Hedley stated it would be a front load garage. Mr. Ouimet asked 1 or 2 bays? Mr. Hedley stated the following: It is one door but it is at least 2 cars wide. The proposed 24 FT x 24 FT garage and it would only be used for rolling cars in in the Fall and bringing them back out in the Spring. Mr. Ouimet asked would these cars have any connection with your other business? Mr. Hedley stated no they are personal cars. Mr. Nadeau stated so really it would just be a storage garage. Mr. Hedley stated yes, that's all it is and it would not be for a daily use garage. Mrs. Murphy stated the following: Is that an appropriate use? I would have to look into that just because on a commercial site plan usually any accessory buildings are exempt to the use of the building application. Mr. Hedley stated the following: The garage would be used for storage for the accounting office but not for accounting records because we wouldn't store confidential records out there. There are other things that we don't have a lot of space in our building for. I just had to throw out a couple of desks because we had not place to keep them, but I would have liked to have kept them so when we expand we would already have had the furniture. Mr. Watts stated so; you would be storing lawnmowers and things like that in the proposed garage. Mr. Hedley stated yes, we have snow blowers and lawnmowers and some other long-term storage stuff that we have been just stacking up inside the current building. Or I would have to take them back and forth to my house, which is a pain in the neck. Mr. Higgins stated but access to that building is going to be limited if you have cars parking in front of that garage. Mr. Hedley stated you would be able to get into the building because it is a few feet back but you wouldn't be able to drive a car in and out but that's okay. Mr. Higgins stated but would you be able to get the lawnmower and snow blower out if cars were packed in front of that garage. Mr. Hedley stated there would be no problem getting that stuff out of there because it is set back a few feet from the parking lot. Mr. Higgins stated on the drawing it looks like it's very close and that is why we're asking. Mr. Hedley stated the garage would probably be about 3 FT off of the lot. Mr. Watts asked is the architecture of the building going to match what you already have? Mr. Hedley stated yes, the same color, the same siding and everything else would be the same as the existing buildings. Mr. Higgins asked are there any wetlands back there? Mr. Hedley stated no, it is along side our water drainage system and we don't even have to re-grade because it's already on the same grade. Mrs. Murphy stated the following: I just read the accessory building definition and as long as you are using it for storage for things that have to do with operating the business, and if you are putting cars in there, that those are cars that you utilize in running your business, then it could be an accessory building that would be allowable. If these are just cars that are personal cars that has nothing to do at all with the running of the business, you wouldn't be able to store them there. We couldn't approve a use for the storage of your personal cars. They can only approve a use for something that has to do with the businesses that are being operated there incidental to the building. Mr. Hedley stated there will be stuff incidental to the building, but you're telling me if I park a personal car there, I would be violating the Town laws? Mrs. Murphy stated no, I'm telling you the principal purpose for the accessory building has to be incidental to the use of the business. Mr. Hedley stated well it is. Mr. Nadeau asked would this require CHA review? Mr. Bianchino stated the following: Before you stamp it and sign it for approval, we could go and do a site visit or Mr. Williams and I can discuss it because I haven't seen this site since it was finished. If the Board is comfortable, you can condition it on us visiting the site. Mr. Higgins stated or even move it a little bit to the north if we are concerned about it being too close to that stormwater area. Mr. Dave Bell, of Liberty Builders, stated the following: I will be the one constructing the building. The object was to keep it forward of the karate school but off the parking lot. There is enough room where I can keep it right inside that envelop; keep it forward of the karate school and keep it away from the bank in the back that you are talking about. Mr. Watts asked is the building going to sit on the parking lot? Mr. Bell

stated no, behind the parking lot. Mr. Hedley stated the following: There would be no parking that would be replaced. Currently there is a tree there that is dying and I would have to remove the tree. Mrs. Murphy asked Mr. Williams is there was any greenspace issue. Mr. Williams stated they have adequate greenspace and they meet our minimum requirements. Mr. Ouimet stated the following: I'm a little confused on what you just said; you said you wanted to construct the building forward of the karate school. Does that mean closer to Route 9? Mr. Bell stated no, it would be in the back of the karate school and it goes toward the back of the property line towards that bank that we have been talking about and it would stay forward of the rear line of that. Mr. Ouimet stated okay, thank you.

Mr. Nadeau made a motion to approve the addition to site plan application for Veyeper Realty, LLC condition on CHA and Planning visiting the site. Mr. Ruchlicki seconded. Motion carried.

Old Business:

11.102 OB Gendron's Truck Center Pre-owned, 1637 Route 9 – Commercial Site Plan & Sign

Mr. Tim Vadney, General Manager for Gendron's Truck Center, stated the following: I back before the Board and hopefully I have everything that you required. At the last meeting there was a questions about the septic tank and where the shrubbery would be located because we did not have that on our plans. I believe we have that to your liking now. Mr. Watts stated this application was referred to CHA and we had questions relative to was there a septic or was there sewer on Route 9. Mr. Vadney stated yes, we clarified that we had municipal water but not septic and now we have that on the plans. Mr. Watts stated okay and the other question was to show the landscaping, the building and the whole thing, right? Mr. Vadney stated right, we didn't have anything depicted on Route 9 and you wanted to see that, which we now have done. Mr. Bianchino stated the following: We looked at the last plan submitted and the landscaping had been added and some clarifications that we asked for were also included. We also asked about lighting and I think that was addressed in the narrative in their response. They're not going to have a dumpster. They handicapped the site so there is no concern about access. The only other thing that we talked about was drainage and I think we found another change for the drainage on the site. Mr. Watts asked did they submit a site plan regarding the entire parcel? Mr. Williams stated yes and they gave us a master plan of the whole site showing all the water connections, the septic on each site and the drainage that is there on the site. Mr. Watts asked is the action that we're taking now for that whole site or just for this one parcel? Mr. Williams stated it is just for the one proposed use on the proposed site. Mr. Watts stated that is part of good planning to look at things from one place to another and take larger visions of the development in the Town. Mr. Higgins asked Mr. Dan Cummings, owner of the property, is there a water main shutoff for the Town of Halfmoon water somewhere on the site? Mr. Williams stated the following: That was the modular home site. That is the site that AAA built on and that is where that problem was. Mr. Higgins stated okay, then I withdraw that questions. Mr. Roberts asked would you just be refacing the signs that are already there? Mr. Vadney stated yes. Mr. Roberts asked would there be any change in the lighting scheme? Mr. Vadney stated no. Mr. Watts asked the applicant to please advertise that they are located in Halfmoon. Mr. Vadney stated okay.

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

#1 Sign Gendron Truck Center

Sign Size: Free-standing 25 SF (2) = 50 SF

Sign Dimensions: 5ft x 5ft

Total Height: 14 ft 10 in

Sided: one-sided Two-sided

Location of Sign: **monument sign**

Lighted: Internal Flood

#2 Sign Gendron Truck Center

Sign Size: Wall Mounted 32 SF

Sign Dimensions: **4ft x 8ft**

Sided: one-sided Two-sided

Location of Sign: **to be placed on sales office building**

Lighted: Internal Flood

Mr. Ruchlicki made a motion to approve the commercial site plan application for Gendron's Truck Center Pre-owned. Mr. Higgins seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the sign application for Gendron's Truck Center Pre-owned. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Ruchlicki made a motion to adjourn the October 24, 2011 Planning Board Meeting at 8:26 pm. Mr. Higgins seconded. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
Milly Pascuzzi
Planning Board Secretary