

3/14/22

**MINUTES MEETING
Town of Halfmoon Planning Board
March 14, 2022**

Those present at the March 14, 2022 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board Members:

Don Roberts –Chairman
Marcel Nadeau- Vice Chairman
John Higgins
Tom Koval
Rich Berkowitz
Thomas Werner-absent
Mike Ziobrowski

Planning Board Alternates:

Brendan Nielsen
Chuck Lucia

Coordinator- Building, Planning and Development:

Richard Harris

Senior Planner / Stormwater Management Technician:

Paul Marlow

Town Attorney:

Lyn Murphy

Deputy Town Attorney:

Cathy Drobny

Town Board Liaison(s):

John Wasielewski
Eric Catricala

Town Engineers:

Joel Bianchi

Chairman Don Roberts opened The Planning Board Meeting at 7:00 pm

Don Roberts: Good evening, I would like to call the meeting to order. Have the Board members had a chance to review the minutes from the last meeting?

Rich Berkowitz: I make a motion to approve.

Tom Koval: I have to recuse myself.

3/14/22

Marcel Nadeau: Ill second

Don Roberts: Tom recused himself. All in favor aye? (All in favor) Opposed? (None were opposed) Motion carried.

New Business:

22.029 Tao Best Spa, 1673 Rt. 9 Healthplex- Change of Use/ Tenant & Sign

Rich Berkowitz: I have to recuse myself

Don Roberts: Rich Berkowitz asked to recuse himself, anyone here to present this? Okay Steve come up please. Say your name and what you plan on doing.

Steve Burke: Healthplex Fitness, Healthplex building in Halfmoon.

Don Roberts: And what's coming in here?

Steve Burke: We are here to propose, the Tao Best Spa, they currently have three other locations in Colonie and in Ballston Spa and Schenectady. They'll have about 3 to 4 employees there a day, five days. The space has been a chiropractor and a massage facility now for 20 years, so we are just adding another massage spot.

Don Roberts: Okay, no issues with parking right?

Steve Burke: Plenty of parking, yea

Don Roberts: Questions by the Board?

Tom Koval: Steve Im just going to say the same things I do to everybody that comes in front of us ,after the fact , it's not the way we do business here in Halfmoon anymore. If you get a tenant you come in prior to moving that tenant in to this space to get approval to move that tenant into that space. We don't want to have to catch you after the fact.

Steve Burke: I don't understand what you're saying?

Tom Koval: Has the tenant been in there for a while?

Steve Burke: There is no tenants in there.

Richard Harris: Have they been renovating

Steve Burke: I've never done a spa, they have never done a single treatment in that space

Tom Koval: I was reading in the preliminary that it was discovered by the

Steve Burke: That space has been empty since 2020 pre-Covid

Lyn Murphy: And they are currently in the process of fitting it up, correct?

3/14/22

Steve Burke: They put a skin on inside new doors, signage, and carpet

Lyn Murphy: Without the necessary permits, that's fine you are here now

Tom Koval: All Im saying is when you move a new tenant in, come to us prior to doing your fit up, prior to your tenant doing anything. I am not telling you anything different than I tell everybody else that comes in with the same situation.

Steve Burke: Okay

Don Roberts: Now for the sign that is going to replace what was there before, the other company?

Steve Burke: Correct.

Don Roberts: And sign wise they are underneath their allotment right, okay questions by the Board?

Mike Ziobrowski: I would like to make a motion to approve the change of tenant

Marcel Nadeau: Ill second.

Don Roberts: Tom recused himself. All in favor aye? (All in favor) Opposed? (None were opposed) Motion carried.

Mike Ziobrowski: I would like to make a motion to approve the sign.

Marcel Nadeau: Ill second it.

Don Roberts: Tom recused himself. All in favor aye? (All in favor) Opposed? (None were opposed) Motion carried. your all set.

Steve Burke: Thank you very much, appreciate it.

Tao Best Spa (Healthplex) – Change of Use/Tenant & Sign APPROVED. Board approved Change of Use/Tenant and Sign applications for a massage and wellness office.

22.031 Townline MCA Development Duplex, 239 Middletown Rd. – Special Use Permit

Jennifer Manny: Hello my name is Jennifer Manny, I'm here representing Townline MCA Development at 293 Middletown Road. This property was purchased by us in March 2021 from the Town of Halfmoon. It was formerly used as a municipal Water Building and at the time of purchase it reverted back to its historical zoning of residential. There is an 1840 sq. ft. building on the front of that property and we turned the east side of that building which, less than half of that into a small single residence. We put a single family residence on the east side of the building and now we are seeking to put a second residence on the west side of the building which would result in the building becoming a duplex. We have, there are several existing duplexes within a half mile of that location in all directions, including directly across the street. We are 293 Middletown road and 292 Middletown road is a duplex as well so it seems like it's very much in line with the current neighborhood and the existing properties around there. There is adequate parking to accommodate

3/14/22

this in the building in the way that it is and the way that it was purchased from the Town so that is what we are seeking to do with it.

Don Roberts: Okay thank you, now this will need a public hearing, that being said any questions by the Board?

Tom Koval: I make a motion to set the public hearing for March 28th.

Rich Berkowitz: Ill second

Don Roberts: All in favor aye? (All in favor) Opposed? (None were opposed) Motion carried, see you March 28th.

Jennifer Manny: Okay thank you.

Townline MCA Development Duplex – Special Use Permit PUBLIC HEARING SET. Board received a presentation on a proposed conversion of a single-family home to a two-family (duplex) and set a Public Hearing for March 28, 2022.

**22.025 T-Mobile/ Centerline Communications Co-Location, Elizabeth St. Ext. –
Telecommunication Co-Location/Site Plan**

Don Roberts: They are going to be online, are you there Sir?

Paul Reed: Yes, can you hear me

Don Roberts: Yes, say your name and what you plan on doing please.

Paul Reed: My name is Paul Reed, I work for Sunline Communications, we are working for American Tower with a new tenant that is (inaudible) Elizabeth St. extension and the entity is T- Mobile is planning to install an array of antennae's and associated equipment and approximately a hundred and forty feet on the existing tower, which is one hundred eighty feet tall, and they are going to add that to the base of the tower adjacent within the existing fenced in compound. They plan to install a concrete pad with ground mounted equipment cabinets and associated equipment, cellular equipment along with an emergency generator. It's a pretty straight forward project, the tower has been there for years and it's a good opportunity for T-Mobile to improve their service in the area without the need to developing another tower structure.

Don Roberts: Okay now the height of the tower will not be changing and the pad will not be changing either is that correct?

Paul Reed: That is correct, the height of the tower is not affected at all and the existing compound that T-Mobile is intending to install is within the fenced in concrete, they don't even have to exchange the fences.

Don Roberts: Thank you, questions by the Board?

Tom Koval: I have a couple questions first, you said you're adding a generator to this site?

Paul Reed: Yes, an emergency generator on the pad that T-Mobile is planning to install.

3/14/22

Tom Koval: Do you have a size on the generator?

Paul Reed: Yes they have it listed as a 35kw generator.

Tom Koval: Okay you're going to have to pull a permit for that, we have to review that.

Paul Reed: Okay, that's fine

Tom Koval: So I think have to hold off until, do we have to hold off?

Richard Harris: Did you have that on your plans?

Paul Reed: Yes, yes it's on the plans.

Tom Koval: So they do have a generator

Paul Reed: On the plan C-101

Richard Harris: It should be in your packets, but is the decibels level on that at 23 feet? Is it 85 or less?

Paul Reed: I will get some specs and get that for you, the decibel level at 23 feet is that what?

Richard Harris: Well that's typically the measurement on a generator, when they publish the decibel level it's measured at 23 feet.

Rich Berkowitz: Are there other generators there now?

Paul Reed: According to the plan there is, according to the plans yes there is a generator.

Rich Berkowitz: Is it any bigger than the other ones?

Paul Reed: I don't know the size of the one that's already there. So what kind of permit for an emergency generator.

Richard Harris: If this Board approves that it is part of the site plan if they were to vote today you would need that as part of your building permit you would need to get a generator permit as part of it.

Paul Reed: Alright, alright that makes sense, we're used to getting permits for these type of things, understood.

Rich Berkowitz: I make a motion for a negative declaration for SEQR

Marcel Nadeau: Ill second it.

Don Roberts: All in favor aye? (All in favor) Opposed? (None were opposed) Motion carried.

Rich Berkowitz: I make a motion to approve the co-location contingent on the generator meeting Town regulations.

Marcel Nadeau: Ill second it.

Don Roberts: All in favor aye? (All in favor) Opposed? (None were opposed) Motion carried, good luck.

Paul Reed: Thank you very much, thanks for taking the time. Good night.

T-Mobile/Centerline Communications Co-Location– Telecommunication Co-Location/Site Plan, APPROVED. Board received a presentation on a proposal to install new co-location and ground equipment on the existing tower with conditions that the proposed generator meet Town specifications.

22.038 Park Place on the Peninsula (fmr. Halfmoon Village), Beach Rd- PDD Amendment Recommendation

John Montagne: Good evening everybody John Montagne with Greenman Pederson Engineers, here to present to you just briefly a PDD modification proposed for what was formerly known at the Halfmoon Village and Yacht Club and that is actually part of the PDD amendment we are looking for this evening. The main purpose for tonight’s meeting is to go through the fact that we are adding a small public park to this PDD. The public park was part of the original PDD many years ago and now it’s being proposed again because the Town Board has some interest in making the connection to the river again and they have the trails through there. So the five parts to the PDD amendment that we’re looking for first of all is an official name change of the PDD to the Park Place on the Peninsula from the former Halfmoon Village. The second part is a slight modification in how the roadway contribution will be paid out, it will be assessed at \$1,100 dollars per unit for the first 150 units and then that will increase to \$1,596 for the balance of the units, that’s just to give a little off set because of some of the price increases that we’re seeing in the market right now. The park itself again a three acre park that I’ll go through in a little more detail in the next slides, by adding the park the Town Board has agreed that the recreation fee would be dropped to \$500 dollars per unit, and then the very last section is just an amendment that modifies the approval of this PDD for a 5 year period from the date of this amendment. So the park itself will have a few amenities that I wanted to go through this evening. First it will contain a small 6 parking space parking lot with one AD accessible space, it will have internal walkway system there will be a small park identification sign at the road. Within the park there will be a small seating area that will have picnic tables in it, within that area there will be 2 pedestal mounted charcoal grills and then there will be a pergola structure for a shade structure in the center of it. At the end of the park towards along the river there will be a small removable fishing pier, the park will have pathway lighting and there will be landscape plantings. The Town will actually take over this park at its completion, and after approval and acceptance by the Board. So the next slide shows an overall site plan on the far right of this so you can see where the park is so it really is along the edge of the property linking what would be the trail system from the Town which is just down the road at the end of Beach road to here and then access down to the river. Next slide shows a site rendering of this just how it would fit in with the property in the buildings, the next slide shows this without the trees so it’s easier to see, you can see where the seating area is, where the picnic tables would be, where the pergola structure will be and then the pathway that goes down to the river and the floating dock. The parking area will be up towards the front, as you pull in, this square rectangle you see there is the projects pump station there is just a small shed building there and that is actually going to be conveyed to Saratoga County Sewer District #1 at completion of that construction. So the next slide shows what the site looks like currently, we have started construction on this as you know a year ago when Covid came and we stopped, but this shows how the sites been cleared and prepped and the

3/14/22

area on the left there where the road goes through is the area where the park will be and then the next slide is just a rendering , an artistic rendering that was done of what that would look like, and that is the extent of what I wanted to present this evening so open up for questions.

Don Roberts: Okay, thank you, according to our Town Ordinance we could have an optional public information meeting, but since the Town Board is required to have a public hearing. I don't think we need to have a public informational meeting just to go through the same thing over again, is that okay with the Board?

Tom Koval: It's fine with us.

Don Roberts: Okay that being said comments from the Board?

Rich Berkowitz: I'll make a motion to make a positive recommendation back to the Town Board for the PDD

Mike Ziobrowski: Second

Don Roberts: All in favor for a positive recommendation say Aye (all were in favor) Opposed (none were opposed) got a positive recommendation.

John Montagne: Thank you very much.

Don Roberts: Your welcome, good luck.

Park Place on the Peninsula PDD– PDD Amendment Recommendation

POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION. Board received a presentation and made a Positive Recommendation to the Town Board to amend the Park Place on the Peninsula PDD (Halfmoon Village PDD).

22.009 Tribley Residential PDD, 315 Farm to Market Rd – PDD Recommendation

Jason Dell: Good evening my name is Jason Dell Im an engineer with Lansing Engineering here on behalf of the applicant for the Tribley residential PDD. Our goal for this evening is to introduce the project to the Planning Board with the goal being for this Board to eventually provide a positive recommendation to the Town Board for the proposed PDD. The project site is located at 315 Farm to Market Road, and encompasses approximately 22.08 acres, the site is located immediately west of the intersection of Moreland drive and Farm to Market Road and the parcel is currently zoned as AR Residential. The surrounding land uses and zoning include Arlington Heights to the west and south west as well as the Pine Brook Hills PDD to the north. So for our project we are proposing a new PDD and the proposal consists of development of 42 single family lots. Access into the project will be from a road originating from Farm to Market Road and will extend into the project and will connect over into Saville Row. It will be approximately 2450 linear ft. of proposed roadway that is intended to be dedicated to the Town of Halfmoon. Our minimum lot size for the project is about 8500 sq. ft. our maximum lot size is about 37,635 sq. ft. and an average lot size of a little over 14,000 sq. ft. and the proposed setbacks within the project are similar to the adjacent PDD. So, the allowable density for our project is based upon buildable land of the 22.08 acres approximately 4.92 acres are constrained and that includes wetland areas as well as areas with slopes over 15% so that gives us a remaining buildable area of about 17.16 acres, and the Town of Halfmoon code indicates an allowable density of 3 units per acre for a single family PDD. So that would yield and allowable density of 51.48 lots

or 51 lots, so we are proposing 42 lots which gives us a proposed density of about 1.9 units per gross acre and approximately 2.5 units per usable acre. The Town of Halfmoon GEIS statement of findings indicates 20 % of the gross area shall be designated as contiguous open space adjacent to an existing road and you can see along Farm to Market road there we are proposing 4.3 acres of contiguous open space which meets that requirement. We are also proposing a 30 ft. no cut buffer along this southwestern side of the project as well as an additional buffer here with the remainder of this being Army Corps wetlands that can't be disturbed. As a public benefit for the project the applicant has agreed to construct a 6000 sq. ft. maintenance garage at the Town Park for the use by Town personnel. Water and sewer will be provided by a connection to the Halfmoon Water system, and sanitary sewer will be provided by a connection to the Saratoga County Sewer dist. System. Stormwater will be managed onsite, I'd also like to mention that the applicant has agreed, while at the Town Board meeting a member of the public had asked if the applicant would be willing to hold a workshop for the neighbors, the applicant does have that scheduled if anybody would like to attend for the 22nd at 6 pm here in this room. So, with that we're here to answer any initial question you folks may have with the hope to move the project forward.

Don Roberts: Thank you Jason, first of all this has to be referred to our Town Engineer, MJ Engineering for review, it has to be referred to Saratoga County Planning Board and also the fire district for their review, okay, questions by the Board?

Tom Koval: I think a lot of my question will probably be answered once we get our reviews back from our departments. In the Pre-meeting I expressed some concern about property being turned over to the Town afterwards, you heard my comments on that.

Jason Dell: To address that the contiguous open space to meet the statement of findings, however if this Board and the Town Board would prefer that area could be incorporated into the lots and deed restricted. Right now it's the intent for the applicant to retain ownership of that as a non-buildable lot but depending on how it works out he would be willing to just include that into the lots and deed restrictions.

Tom Koval: I just don't see the point in the Town taking it over and taking it off the tax rolls for somebody else's benefit, the only other thing that I have questions about, not just concerns just questions about public benefit of building 600 sq. ft. maintenance garage that's a wide open

Jason Dell: 6,000

Tom Koval: 6,000 that's a wide open thing in mind, in my end, now you probably have the answer but it doesn't put a dollar figure on it for me; a six thousand sq. ft. tin building or it could be a 6,000 ft. Taj Mahal like the firehouse they are building down the street.

Lyn Murphy: the Town Board is still in negotiations with the applicant as it relates to the public benefit so

Tom Koval: Im just putting it out there that that's something that, when it comes back I would like more clarification on.

Jason Dell: Understood

Don Roberts: Also Jason referring to the proposed connector road to Arlington Heights I think we should have a traffic study done for that purpose

3/14/22

Marcel Nadeau: And just to clarify the connection that was always proposed in the Belmonte PDD initially, so we always wanted an access

Don Roberts: That's true marcel thanks for bringing that up.

Tom Koval: Like I said in the pre-meeting if Im clear on State Code for this, you can correct me but this project as well as Arlington Heights should not have been built with only one access by State Code you can't have that many homes on a project with one access so

Jason Dell: You can but the houses would need to have sprinklers without a secondary point access

Tom Koval: Right, Arlington heights was already done, not to meet the proper code I can't allow another one not to meet the proper code and Im not saying, Im not trying to disappoint Arlington Heights however we need to have two access to this project and Arlington Heights needs to have two accesses. I've seen prior letters from our Arlington Heights residents complaining about the access being shut down because of fire activity up at an accident or something but now it seems they've changed now they don't like the nature of the other project, you can't have it both ways and for safety's reasons there should be two accesses regardless whether this project happens or not that second access should be built.

Marcel Nadeau: And, again it was always the intent of the Planning Board to have that access

Don Roberts: Yes, it was, and Town Board also, okay

Rich Berkowitz: Jason the density of the project is similar to other projects in the area in the type of homes?

Jason Dell: Yes, and it meets the current PDD code within the Town Code

Don Roberts: Anyone else? Okay as I said we will refer it to the three agencies, and we will get back to you alright.

Jason Dell: Alright

Don Roberts: Thank you.

Richard Harris: The applicant for the Tribble Residential PDD has scheduled a public meeting that he and or his staff and engineer organized and reserved this room for March 22nd at 6 pm, it's not something the Town or this Planning Board is sponsoring or running, it's purely him renting it for purposes that he will discuss at that meeting to talk to people I wasn't aware of the date until tonight. So its March 22nd at 6 pm in this room, just so you, in case anybody didn't catch it at the beginning of Mr. Dells presentation.

Don Roberts: Okay thank you Rich, thank you, Lyn.

Tribble Residential PDD– PDD Recommendation

TABLED/REFERRED TO AGENCIES. Board received a presentation on the proposed 42-lot single-family home

Old Business:

21.159/ 21.160

ELP Halfmoon Solar, 48 Smith Road – Site plan & Special Use Permit

Lyn Murphy: While he is doing that, if any of you intends to attend the March 22nd 6pm, understand that you're attending as residents of the Town of Halfmoon, not as planning Board members. Because you can't have three of you in a room, the Board itself. You can go but you just can't say as a Planning Board member I say.

Richard Harris: Can I just reiterate incase people missed it at the beginning of Mr. Dells presentation, the applicant for the Tribley Residential PDD has scheduled a public meeting that he and or his staff and engineer organized and reserved this room for March 22nd at 6 pm. That's not something the Town or the Planning Board is sponsoring or running, it's purely him renting it for purposes that he will discuss at that meeting to talk to people, I wasn't aware of the date until tonight, so its March 22nd 6 pm in this room in case anybody didn't catch it at the beginning of Mr. Dells presentation.

Don Roberts: Okay thank you Rich, thank you Lyn. Okay go ahead guys.

Will Bliss: Good evening everyone my name is Will Bliss, Im here with my colleague Jamie Fordyse with Insite Partners, we are presenting our ELP Halfmoon Solar project, and I just want to give a quick summary of the project and then ultimate talk to the updated design. So this project was originally presented to the Planning Board back in September , public hearing for the project was held in December last year although the project followed the Towns typical approval process many members of the community had felt and expressed at the public hearing that they had received limited notice and limited information about the project , since that time we have made a concerted effort to work closely with members of the Planning Board and local residents to review and revise the proposed project to ensure a thorough review has taken place and the concerns presented by the public have been fully addressed. Prior to the January meeting we submitted a letter to the Planning Board which answered many of the concerns presented during the public hearing in December. Examples of some of these concerns were related to construction impacts, general safety of living near a solar project, noise impact, and wildlife displacement To home values stormwater management, disturbance of wetlands. To address these concerns, we presented resources from multiple resources, related to solar projects, a full stormwater analysis and SWPPP, jurisdictional letters from the DEC and Army Corps of Engineers. Site specific noise and glare analysis. All of these have been submitted to MJ Engineering and reviewed. Additionally, as compared to other types of development which present long multi phased construction periods and significant environmental and local impacts are proposed project, would be a passive low impact form of development in keeping with the rural and residential characteristics of the district. In reviewing the comments presented by the Public members of the Planning Board and MJ Engineering it was clear that the potential visual impacts of the project were the one remaining item that had not yet been adequately addressed in the proposal. Multiple members of the public did note however in their comments that they weren't necessarily opposed to the project in general but that required buffer and set back impacts needed to be increased. Over the past month we've been listening to feed- back from residents and conducted multiple site visits with members of the Board to provide an opportunity to objectively observe the existing vegetation on site and the level of screening needed to provide of our proposed set- backs and our landscaping. The project originally proposed a 50 foot original setback in keeping with the ordinance in January we then proposed a 100 ft. setback, but upon further review and examining the existing vegetation on site it was clear establishing a hundred foot no cut zone would be adequate for screening the project so the revised design now incorporates a minimum of a hundred feet of existing vegetation to be retained along all property boundaries of neighboring properties. The projects also proposed a hedgerow of roughly a 130 ft. or 130 trees, each of these trees would be 5 to 6 feet tall when they are planted a mix of white spruce and balsam firs. These would be planted behind the existing vegetation, and no cut zone that would be left in place. Lastly, we've proposed a fence which includes a green privacy

mesh to further obscure the project and that would be behind roughly a 120 ft. of existing vegetation and landscaping. We've provided updated renderings which model the updated design and highlight the fact that the project will have little to no aesthetic impact to the neighboring properties. Two of these renderings are display the property during leaf off conditions and one of the renderings is taken from a second story home on Misty Meadow.

Richard Harris: The Board received everything submitted and I do have the renderings from all of your various data, I can put them up when you want, we could go through them whatever. Whenever you're ready.

Will Bliss: Great, great so I mean I guess I don't need to summarize any further than I think Jamie just wanted to speak a little bit to the proposal generally at a high level and then we'd be happy to answer any question about the revised proposal.

Jamie Fordyce: Jamie Fordyce with Eastlite Partners, yea I think Will did a good job in summarizing how we arrived here with our updated proposal, I think the only other issue I wanted to speak to relatively directly because it's come up through the comments and some of the discussion is a compatibility of the project within the zone and the characterization of the use there has been some inferences that solar at this scale is an industrial use, I think we would feel very strongly that it is not when we think about an industrial use we think of impacts that can't be avoided but for the location of a project. We think of order, we think of noise, we think of imposing visual impacts that stacks and like I said impacts that you need to zone in order to avoid and I would just contrast that here against a project which has no noise as we have demonstrated at the border, under 10 truck traffic per year for ongoing maintenance and that there's clearly a project with adequate setback will be invisible from the boundary and that's what we tried to achieve here. That's consistent with the precedent that has been set by the Town in approving other solar projects within the Zone. So I think with that we can probably turn to the renderings and the materials we've presented, we can just start where we are here. Yea so what we have tried to do here I think we recognized that renderings are not the only way to look at visual impacts and we've tried to come at it at multiple angles here but what you see on through the center line area here is a representation of elevation view of the panels, the vegetative buffer that will remain in place if you look closely you will see the planted vegetation there which will be planted 5 to 6 feet height against the panels at their max grade will be 8 feet above grade and then we have a fence a 7 foot fence which is between the panels and behind the planted vegetation that we have proposed a green mesh for, and so you can see that, as we will see on the renderings there is quite dense understory and a lot of coverage on the site particularly along Misty Meadow Way, this is a view from Smith road looking southwest through the interior of the site this is not quite a leaf off this is taken in May of last year pre-development, post development is what we see there and this is representing a hundred feet of vegetative buffer remaining, planted vegetation in front of the fence and again the fence line so really there is not perceptible impact here so really this is the least dense of the understory that we have surrounding the site. Here we have a view from Misty Meadow way looking south on leaf on conditions, existing vegetation, and this is the current proposal, with 130 panel setback, a 100 ft of existing vegetation. Here again another location on Misty Meadow Way this is with a leaf off condition, existing, and proposed and then lastly it was requested that we get a second story visual, this is looking out of the second story of a residence on Misty Meadow Way, leaf off again, existing and proposed, okay and the final elements of this visual presentation here this is from a site visit and we did encourage any member who was available to come join us for a site visit to really once we had flagged 130 feet interior to the site walked that distance with us and either look out towards the abutting property or look in from the residences this is looking into the site there are actually 6 members of the Board standing at the flags here so, sorry 3 members of the Board, 2 Planners and Will. That was just last week, and then from the interior out this is earlier without the snowstorm, this is how obscured you can see the residential homes in a post leaf off condition. Once again with some snow, so you

know I think we'd be, we feel very strongly that this is a use that's keeping with the residential nature, low impact use in the district. We have really made a very concerted effort to address the concern, we do recognize that without proper set back and screening there is a visual impact, but I believe that in the current proposal we've addressed that visual impact and we're open to comments from the Board.

Don Roberts: Okay, that it?

Jamie Fordyce: Yea

Don Roberts: Thank you , now as everyone knows we had a public hearing on this , many concerns were raised by the public and the applicant made alterations to the plan and in two separate meetings so we don't have a quorum , in two separate meetings Board members went out and visited the site and I don't know how this is going to go tonight , but personally I want to commend both you guys for Jamie and Will for the effort in addressing the concerns of the neighbors , thank you I appreciate that, that being said comments by the Board?

Marcel Nadeau: Don Can I read an article on the special use permit?

Don Roberts: Go ahead

Marcel Nadeau: Its Article 165-82; the purpose is special use approval is to allow the proper integration of uses into the community and zoning districts which are only suitable in such areas given certain conditions in that appropriate locations, because of their characteristics or the special characteristics of the area in which they are to be located , special uses require special consideration so that they may be properly located with respect to the objectives of the chapter and their effect on the surrounding properties , sub paragraph is the use shall be in such a location and of such size and character that will be in harmony with the appropriate and orderly development of the district in which it is situated and not be detrimental to the orderly development of adjacent districts. I just want the Board to be aware of that.

Don Roberts: Thank you Marcel, anyone else?

Tom Koval: After my site visit, I was taken by the lack of impact I felt it would have to the community and I also looked at the whole project as part of that entire area that we've been dealing with for the past few years with traffic and everything else I personally feel it's a better fit than another 50, 60 houses with the traffic issues we have there. Its, I don't think from what I saw your gonna see a lot of this solar array from the roads. I think it's much less visually, it stands out much less visually than a housing project would stand out, its less impact on the area, its less impact on traffic, on our schools and I feel it's a good use for the property and it allows the land owner who has been paying taxes forever to maintain ownership of this property without burdening the community with more infrastructure.

Don Roberts: Thank you Tom I agree, anyone else?

John Higgins: During the site visit, I had mentioned about the fact that this fence is going to be 7 feet and that the array is 8 feet, I had requested raising the fence to 8 feet and you were going to look into that I guess you decided you didn't want to do that?

Will Bliss: We are happy to raise it to 8 feet

3/14/22

John Higgins: We did mention it on the site visit, that's the reason I brought it up.

Will Bliss: We're happy to do that I didn't realize that, that was a request meant, my apologies

John Higgins: I mentioned it when we did the site visit

Will Bliss: And that's not a problem

John Higgins: There is no barbed wire or anything like that at the top of the fence?

Will Bliss: Okay thank you.

Mike Ziobrowski: Can you please remind me, what's the extent of the lease?

Will Bliss: The term?

Mike Ziobrowski: The term

Will Bliss: The term is a 20 -year lease with 2, five year extensions

Mike Ziobrowski: So, after 30 years then

Will Bliss: 35

Mike Ziobrowski: 35 at that point in time, what happens to the property?

Will Bliss: We have a decommissioning plan that was part of MJ's review and so we're posting a security to in the instance that the project is not still operating and is not dissembled by us the Town has the financial security to go in there , that is not the intent , the intent is just to provide security, I would say that this solar use is entirely reversible that's why we have a decommissioning plan and I don't think any other development of this nature or this extent is required to come forward at the start of the project with a decommissioning plan but if we continue to need energy I think that the project would continue to operate.

Mike Ziobrowski: So what happens if the owner of the property decides that at some point in time doesn't like the solar field on his property?

Tom Koval: They are under contract

Will Bliss: Yea the lease runs with the land so any

Mike Ziobrowski: So, if he gives it to his other family members it now runs through them or if he gives it to a developer it runs through them?

Will Bliss: The land can't be put into any other use while the lease is valid

Mike Ziobrowski: Ok.

Jamie Fordyce: It might be helpful too, I mean Joel reviewed a number of decommissioning plans of this nature, I think that it might be helpful to highlight that he's reviewed and improved the plan and that its consistent with probably what he's seen, but

Tom Koval: So, we are kicking the can down the road, 30 years from now it might be 50 houses. But meanwhile we don't have to look at 50 houses for the next 30 years.

Mike Ziobrowski: Or maybe we do

Tom Koval: We don't have to deal with the traffic for the next 30 years until we can do something with the roads or NYS finally comes up with the money to fix route 9 the way they should so in my opinion its benefitting us right now because every meeting we have here about Farm to Market Road we argue about traffic on it

Mike Ziobrowski: And we will continue to argue

Tom Koval: More so if we had another 50 homes.

Charlie Lucia: A couple of pretty basic questions but one I think you mentioned the chain link will have the vinyl insert so this is not really an open chain link and therefore that will obscure some of that view even more so and the second thing is the tree line that your putting in , you have to forgive me for asking this , I was working with the County at one time when somebody put a tree row in to help obscure the view of something then the next year the whole row died what happens then?

Jamie Fordyce: We actually, if you read the notes in our planting plan and our landscaping plan, we actually have a guarantee in there that the contractor is required to maintain the plantings for a period of a year, the owner will be required to maintain those but typically they get pretty well established after a year.

Richard Harris: Charlie to help supplement that I can tell you we do have that happen with other commercial projects, we have it happen on residential projects and what our practice from a code enforcement angle of what our office does w then pursue it through a violation of the site plan. A good example is Walmart, before I came on board 9 years ago I think almost every spring , staff had to reach out to Walmart hey you've got a few dead trees, this is on the Plant Road side, it's gotten to the point where I have been here 9 years and never had to do that , because when we notice a dead or dying tree either they are about to replace it or we call them and they are like yea , the guy is coming Friday, so it takes some code enforcement sometimes , im not saying these guys would ignore their duty but most recently we had it with Graybar a number of their trees off 146 and Werner rd. died within a year and we started down the road of code enforcement, they took care of it , I can tell you and we would , Im confident if for some reason the applicant was late getting to that , confident we would either have a neighbor or the property owner alert us and we would pursue it like we have other projects. We do have some residential projects, it's happened to and before the new homeowner moved in we had to reach out to the builder please replace that, your approved plan shows it. So it was residential and non- residential so we are prepared to do that like we have with other projects, to give you an idea.

Charlie Lucia: Thank you.

Mike Ziobrowski: Are there any benefits to the Town for this project?

Jamie Fordyce: Sure , some of them are outside the preview of a Planning Board but there is a tax agreement that we'll put in place with each of the taxing jurisdictions, that will to Toms point , provide a net benefit in terms of income in with no draw on resources, we have already executed that agreement with the County because they have been responsive but we've put the Town and the School district everyone responded that they intend to enter into a pilot agreement with the project to allow for that benefit to flow.

Lyn Murphy: The factors set for the in the application as it relates to special use permit does not require that there be a benefit for the Town.

Mike Ziobrowski: It was just a question, are there benefits?

Lyn Murphy: I was just letting you know that

Jamie Fordyce: Additionally I'll say that this is a community solar project as we have introduced in the past so the credits that are generated by the facility are available to local residences and businesses and we would be happy to make those credits available first to residents and businesses of Halfmoon , its typically a 10 percent savings on your utility bills, so as the meter turns at the project it generates a dollar savings we transfer that dollar credit to a local home or business and we're paid by that home or business at a percentage discount to what that dollar is and as it appears on the bill, I know it's a little convoluted we're a slave to the local regulatory framework but that is a local benefit, thank you.

Rich Berkowitz: I mean for me personally Ive never seen a solar array so close to a community or so close to neighborhoods and Ive seen a lot of them, Ive seen them in Florida, California, Maryland , Virginia , Massachusettes , Pennsylvania , never seen one this close. This is my personal opinion, I just don't think it fits in the charectar of the neighborhood.

Jamie Fordyce: Understood, you might not have seen it because it was set back behind 100 feet of vegetation?

Rich Berkowitz: Ive seen aerial views also.

Jamie Fordyce: Okay

Richard Harris: Rich there is the project on Pruyn Hill that is behind

Rich Berkowitz: That's an old farm

Richard Harris: That was zoned residential with a special use permit and there were residenses behind Pruyn Hill.

Rich Berkowitz: Not this many though, that's just a back road, with maybe your talking 10 homes?

Richard Harris: It was more than that

Rich Berkowitz: I haven't been back there, theres not a lot of homes back there, its off Pruyn Hill and its not surrounded by homes either, or its not surrounded by a development.

Don Roberts: Okay anyone else?

3/14/22

John Higgins: Just for my clarification, there is an area on the east side of Smith Road with the hillside that's included in the property, correct? It's not fenced in correct, just for my own information.

Jamie Fordyce: Yes, yea that is all part of the property

John Higgins: Okay, thank you.

Tom Koval: Is that part of your lease or is that just the owners?

Jamie Fordyce: You're talking about across the street or, yea across the street is not part of the lease.

Tom Koval: So the owner could come back and do something else?

John Higgins: No Im talking about the same side of the road.

Jamie Fordyce: If it's in the same side of the road no

John Higgins: Thank you, Rich, yes.

Jamie Fordyce: Yea that wouldn't be able to be developed.

Richard Harris: So that is restricted as part of your agreement?

Jamie Fordyce: I'd have to double check but there is very little I think way to develop that, given the topography and there's also transmission lines that run through it, kind of around the edge.

Don Roberts: So you have no plans for that part?

Jamie Fordyce: No, we have no plans for that.

Will Bliss: For Solar it's the north facing slope it just doesn't make sense to have it there.

Tom Koval: I make a motion for a negative declaration of SEQR

Don Roberts: Ill second it

Don Roberts: All in favor aye I think we better do a roll call on both these, I vote yes.

Rich Berkowitz: Nay

Mike Ziobrowski: Nay

John Higgins: Nay

Tom Koval: I made the motion so yes

Marcel Nadeau: Nay

3/14/22

Charlie Lucia: Yes

Tom Koval: I make a positive recommendation on the special use permit

Don Roberts: You're making a motion for a positive to grant the proposal

Tom Koval: Correct

Don Roberts: I second, roll call once again, aye for me

Rich Berkowitz: Nay

Mike Ziobrowski: Nay

John Higgins: No

Tom Koval: Aye

Marcel Nadeau: Nay

Charlie Lucia: Yes.

Don Roberts: So, its 4 to 3 Im sorry guys, but hey once again I want to commend your efforts on trying to address your concerns, I mean that you guys did a good job, sorry it didn't pass thank you.

ELP Halfmoon Solar – Site Plan & Special Use Permit

DENIED MOTION TO ISSUE A NEGATIVE DECLARATION. Board denied a motion to issue a Negative Declaration pursuant to the NYS Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQR).

19.145 Brookwood Road Subdivision, Phase II, Brookwood Road – Major Subdivision

Lyn recused herself.

Brandon Ferguson: Hi Im Brandon Ferguson with Environmental Design Partnership, Im here tonight with Chris and Chris Marchand both of them from CGM Construction. We were last here in April 2021 so Ill give you a quick overview. Not a lot has changed to the plans, its still a 17 lot subdivision , roads are in the same configuration , we were granted preliminary approval at the last meeting and we've been working on some of the agency stuff , specifically National Grid and Department of Health we also finished up , the Stormwater review with the Town engineer , we got a SPEDES Permit as part of the DOH requirement , we had to bring in some fill before we can finalize stuff with them so that was before we got the SPEDES permit, we got that fill in there its stabilizing right now , we've got some field work to finish up as soon as the snow melts and the snow leaves the ground but we feel like we are pretty close with them and then National Grid was the last one I know Rich has been copied on a number of these emails back and for the we've gotten through the initial review process with them , I feel like we've addressed all of their concerns on it. So we are here tonight to request a possible final approval conditioned on finishing things up with those agencies.

Don Roberts: Okay thank you, questions by the Board?

John Higgins: We mentioned National Grid two years ago when you first came in here, I know National Grid is slow moving to say the least but what happens if they don't grant you ?

Brandon Ferguson: If they don't grant it, then we don't have a project in the end or this configuration of the project so we would have to come back before this Board.

Tom Koval: Then our approval will be based conditional on National Grids approval.

John Higgins: But you feel confident or you're hoping that you're going to get the approval?

Brandon Ferguson: We've been working with them they had a few concerns one was, they were concerned we were going to cut off access to their right of way which we addressed some things pulling back a little bit of curbing and putting some notes on the plans, Im sure that they could still access their right of way, we don't feel like we are cutting it off at all. One of the other concerns was we were crossing a municipal easement that goes through their right of way that's for the water, they are concerned about that Rich has been involved with me and this is going to be a Town road as well, so we had to get a letter from the Town addressing 50 ft. width as well, so we feel like we've addressed all of their concerns and we've gotten past now we are into their more technical kind of review but we have gotten past all of the big items for them.

Don Roberts: Not to be blunt here but any problem between you and National Grid is your problem not ours.

Brandon Ferguson: I agree with that

Don Roberts: Really, right I mean yea, that's just how it is

Richard Harris: Like any other agency besides us that's involved in the review if this Board votes for it and National Grid comes back and tells you, you've got to move it, you don't have a project because it won't match the approved plan here so you've got to probably in that what if case, either come back you know Im sure Chris wouldn't agree with that but you'd have to come back with a slightly re-designed entrance or something like that.

Brandon Ferguson: If we had to redesign that entrance we'd come back here for modification to the approvals.

Don Roberts: Good thanks, thank you. Anyone else?

Tom Koval: I'll make a motion to approve the final subdivision for 17 lots with the condition it's at National Grids approval

Mike Ziobrowski: Ill second

Don Roberts: All in favor aye? (All in favor) Opposed? (None were opposed) Motion carried, good luck.

Brandon Ferguson: Thank you.

Don Roberts: You're welcome.

Brook wood Road Subdivision, Phase II – Major Subdivision (Final)

APPROVED. Board granted final subdivision approval for Ph. II, with a condition regarding National Grid.

21.150 Crescent Commons PDD, 1471 & 1475 Route9-PDD Recommendation

Mike Wieszchowski: Good evening everyone my name is Mike Wieszchowski: im a professional traffic operations engineer with Greenman Pedersen and I was hired on behalf of the Town to do a traffic study on the Crescent Commons PDD. This is a redevelopment of an existing site, the Crescent Commons Plaza plus the land that are the Golden Hill senior mobile home park and some of the land uses are being expanded there has been a connection between the mobile home park and the plaza which isn't currently there. The site currently houses Fred the Butcher which is being expanded by 5,000 sq. ft. There is a vacant restaurant on the site currently which will be redeveloped into an active restaurant.

Richard Harris: Just opened last week, just so you know.

Mike Wieszchowski: Things are moving fast. There is an existing 10,000 sq. ft. strip mall there with office space above it. The strip malls plan to be kept where the office will be converted to apartments as well as putting the additional apartments there. Overall the site will increase by 60 apartment units and there will be a construction of a 3200 sq. ft. office building as well. So we performed a traffic study, we looked at the five pre-existing site access 2 for the mobile home park as well as another 2 proposed access points for the plaza so we looked at all 5 of those access driveways and we looked at 5 intersections as well. The route 9 at Guideboard rd. and at route 236, the Guideboard road at 236 so that whole triangle as well as the route 9 at Stone Quarry rd. and the Guideboard rd., at Plank road. So it's kind of encompassing the whole thing. We looked at the existing traffic, we looked at crash history, and we looked at the trip generation and distribution of the site as well as the operating conditions and a signal warrant as well. As far as the crash history goes the crash history for the triangle sections was done as part of a CHA study that you guys are currently in the middle of to see what potential impact existing traffic already has so we used some information from that study where you're looking at different alternatives including round -about at one of the intersections. We found that the crashes are high at those intersections, but the only one the crash that seemed out of whack as far as percentage wise, more than expected would be the right angle crashes at route 236 and Guideboard road intersection. If you were to move forward with a round- about that would help that right angle issue, other than that , there accident are pretty much it's a heavily congested signalized intersections and there accidents that you would typically see at that so we didn't notice any other accident patterns that would be an issue. The Trip generation we went through that we looked at trips for multi- family housing general office, strip mall, our strip plaza, retail, supermarket and a fine dining restaurant. In the main study there is a table, I don't think it's in the summary stuff, but essentially what it is, the overall plaza as well as the mobile home park together would generate 44 trips in the am peak hour and 319 in the pm hour. Of those trips because now your introducing housing along with retail there's a natural multi – use trip activity that goes on where some of the trips for the retail goes on for the housing. We use calculations from the ITE Traffic Engineering Handbook and they suggested up to 14% onsite could be internally captured to be conservative we actually only took 10% and assumed 10% of the trips would be because of that interaction, meaning that there would be 40, and that would only be in the pm peak hour not the am peak hour because a lot of the retail would be closed during the am peak hour times. So that would leave 44 trips external to the site in the am and 287 trips in the pm. Currently the site generates about 20 trips in the am and 229 trips in the pm so subtracting those trips away from what could potentially be there in the future leaves 24 am peak hour trips and 58 pm peak

hour trips so even though it's a fairly decent sized development a lot of those trips are already on the roadway currently. Because there is only three driveways now and there's going to be five driveways and an interconnect to the mobile home park, when we did our trip distribution we not only had to look where vehicles were going outside of the site but where vehicles might re-direct themselves to a different driveway. So we did that analysis and we looked at that and some of the driveways that are existing are actually a little bit lower in traffic because they choose an alternate driveway to go to, but overall we found a logical way to assign them to the driveways and to the roadway based on where vehicles from the existing site are going now so we use that as a que for the distribution we used. We use the highway capacity manual methodology to look at the level of service as all of you I'm sure know level service A is a very good level of service, very little cars or congestion and it progressively gets down worse as you go the level of service scale from B to C to D to E to F, F would indicate failing operations. Typically we strive for a level of service C where in level service D in the am, pm peak hour would be acceptable. Essentially what we look and saw was that there was a couple movements at the route 9 and Guideboard road intersection that would be operating at level service E, in both the future no build as well as the build, so there was no , there was very minor change between build and no build. Same with Guideboard Road and 236 with eastbound level service was a level service F and eastbound on Stone Quarry Road was also a level service F. However, if you look at the timings of the signals that are out there if you went out there and optimized those signals or if you move forward with some sort of roundabout alternatives the level of service would improve and you wouldn't have those failing operations at those intersections. The only exception to that would be the Stone Quarry Road which is currently a two way stop controlled intersection and currently that east bound approach does fail and there really is no alternative to correct that without traffic signalization. We looked at the signal warrants it does satisfy the signal warrants for the peak hour as well as the four hour and the eight -hour conditions so it satisfies the warning conditions fairly strongly and that's for the existing conditions as well as the build condition. So as far as the general findings go it looks like the site will generate less than 60 trips more than the current site and if you look at DOT guidelines, they suggest anything under 100 trips would not have a significant impact, if you look at the Institute of Transportation and Engineer guidelines they also suggest a 100 trips is that number where you would see a change in level of service. In the analysis that we did showed just that even though we had 60 trips if you distribute them around there is not really that many trips at any individual intersection and there was no noticeable change in level of service at any of the intersections with or without the development. So with that I think that is a general synopsis of the study that was performed.

Don Roberts: Okay any questions by the Board?

Marcel Nadeau: Are you saying should a round- about happen that would bring the service up to A?

Mike Wieszchowski: The roundabout would it would, I mean it all depends on how you design the round-about you know you could have more than one entry lane, different geometry he has different characteristics just a basic single lane round- about I looked at and it's a level service C overall and there is the southbound approach ends up being a level service D which is still in the peak hours would be an acceptable level of service and so that's with just a single lane round-about.

Marcel Nadeau: Thank you.

John Higgins: The Stone Quarry road I know the total impact of the project is within guidelines but that intersection has been a problem for years, I guess my question earlier whether or not because of the amount of accidents at that intersection presently is the State looking at doing something there do you know or are they just ?

Mike Wieszchowski: I was not able to find any information about any current projects that are planned for there.

John Higgins: Okay, so even if the applicant were to contribute to a part of the cost the rest of the cost still wouldn't be covered by the State or probably not?

Mike Wieszchowski: Not unless a project was initiated through them and I'm not aware of the status of that.

John Higgins: Obviously as a Planning Board we always try and look down the road and try and look at improving existing conditions and future conditions and obviously as I said we are aware that, that intersection is presently a problem and we're just trying to look at different ways possibly remedy it in the future, thank you.

Don Roberts: Anyone else? Okay good job.

Mike Wieszchowski: Alright, thank you.

Don Roberts: Joe you're up.

Joe Dannible: Good evening I'm Joe Dannible with the Environmental Design Partnership here on behalf of MRK Real Property and our application for the Crescent Commons Mixed Use Planned Development District. We were last in front of the Board I believe it was in November at which time a traffic study was requested you just heard the results of the traffic study, certainly we agree with the results, this project as itself stands does not have any substantial impact on the road system or surrounding road networks as currently proposed.

Don Roberts: Please let the gentleman speak this is not a public hearing, thank you.

Joe Dannible: So we did make some slight modifications to the PDD between the original application and where we are today as we have been looking at land surrounding the initial 12 acres we've acquired a 2 additional acres of land both located in this location here with some property on Plank road, some additional land here on Plank road about an acre and then in the middle of the park the last piece of landlocked parcel that was not owned is now under contract so that brings the total project area at about 13.3 acres. Now what we did with that land is we didn't actually necessarily increase the density but we are able to come up and make a better project. First if you look over coming off of Plank road before we had a lot that was blind with garages now I've been able to move those garages off to the side creating a separate parking area with detached garages, more of them for the residents of the new 60 units, and then also some street parking as you enter the site at that location. We're also able in the center of the site we now have additional area that will be utilized for either additional parking service areas or stormwater management as we go in to develop the plans further in the future. So the project itself just a brief run through itself I know we've heard this several times but we are taking the second story of the Crescent Commons Plaza removing the second story or the uses from the second story building 2 more stories on top of that and an addition wing off the back of that building to create a mixed use building, retail on the first floor with apartments on the second, third and fourth stories we will have 10,000 sq. ft. of retail 60 apartment units all of them will be marketed towards seniors and young professionals. A mix of one bedroom, one bath up to two bedroom, two baths and anywhere in that range. The rest of the PDD contains the mobile home park which we are not proposing any changes to, we are proposing that an ATM be installed in the parking lot out in this location we are going to do an addition on Fred the Butcher either two small additions one out the front of the side or maybe just one

along the entire side. The existing restaurant that I think everyone might be aware has recently opened and is currently providing services to the community will remain in that location. We will be adding a deck ultimately and then connecting out to route 236 there is another commercial parcel that can be utilized in that area. The PDD itself we don't want to take away from the C-1 zoning on the property so that whole area where Fred the Butcher is the restaurant and the access out onto 236 should all basically remain consistent with any C-1 uses now or in the future 10 , 15 , 20 years from now as the community continues to grow. Just a look at the proposed elevation that we're looking at for the Crescent Commons, again I think it's a substantial upgrade façade of the building from what it is today, I think it's a very attractive building with multiple residential units having a great view and a great mixed use walkable community within the southern end of Halfmoon. These are some of the more detailed use areas I have some slides in there we can certainly answer any questions about them , we did hear from the traffic study and we agree with the traffic study that the Town performed on the parcel. We would like to set a public informational we ask the Board to set a public informational meeting hopefully after that receive a positive recommendation to the Town Board so we could continue the PDD process with the Town Board. Thank you.

Don Roberts: Questions by the Board?

John Higgins: What's the total height of the four story building?

Joe Dannible: 45, 50 feet.

John Higgins: Okay what is allowed by the Town or because it's a PDD it doesn't make a difference?

Richard Harris: PDD they can set their own height upon recommendation by this Board and would be finalized by the Town Board, in general if not stated otherwise in our ordinance its 35 feet.

John Higgins: Okay, thank you. You probably heard me during the traffic study would the applicant be willing to contribute towards a traffic light at Stone Quarry and Route 9 if, if the State was willing to look at putting a light there, just as basically a benefit for the project?

Joe Dannible: So the applicant is proposing a direct financial contribution to the traffic improvements in the area, around the site whether they go to a traffic light at Stone Quarry or to a round -about construction that would really be up to the Town, there is

John Higgins: There is a contribution, okay thank you very much.

Rich Berkowitz: I just have a quick question since it is a 4 -story building, these units have a sprinkler system?

Joe Dannible: Yes, the building will have an automatic sprinkling system.

Rich Berkowitz: Okay.

Richard Harris: And just John to answer follow up the proposal is \$32,700 as a contribution towards traffic improvements.

Don Roberts: Go ahead Mike you just got to say your name, go ahead.

Michael Klimkiewicz: Michael Klimkiewicz the owner of the project, proposed project, actually John we've committed to \$2,000 per door so its \$120,000 we have committed to the Town.*

John Higgins: That's great I hopefully it will go in the right areas

Don Roberts: Okay thank you Mike, thank you, and any other questions for Joe?

Marcel Nadeau: The lot that's contingent is that next to the exit on 236?

Joe Dannible: Im not sure I follow the question.

Tom Koval: He is asking if the lot that was contingent sales on 236 it's not it's on Plank Road, correct.

Joe Dannible: So there's two parcels that are under contract or being purchased , one is over there just where Rich is showing where the storm pond and garages are, the second one is directly in the center of the property that land itself the house will remain on that I believe, Mike can you correct me if Im wrong , your purchasing it then leasing back the house to the resident that currently lives there and they are going to stay there for the time being and then in the future Mike would own that and would incorporate it into the PDD as well.

Don Roberts: That's right.

Mike Klimkewicz: Yes that's correct. So Ill own the entire parcel for the time the tenants going to stay there and live out the rest of his life.

Don Roberts: Okay thank you. Anyone else.

Mike Ziobrowski: Kind of a silly question, but the fencing that's between the property is kind of an odd feature, but it's not; is or is there not a fence there, on the back side of the entrance it looks like there is one of some nature , right in the center , if you look in the center

Joe Dannible: There is a fence around the retention area we are proposing a fence it's between the parking lot and the closest mobile home units down where the access road connect over 236 .

Mike Ziobrowski: And you'll have those in the site plan?

Joe Dannible: Yea and ultimately we have to come back to this Board for full site plan review.

Richard Harris: Yea if the PDD is approved then they will come back for a little more detailed , obviously storm water and site design.

Rich Berkowitz: Are those units there already or are they proposed?

Joe Dannible: I believe only one of them is not the one that's closest to the access road I don't believes been placed.

**Please note: following the meeting, J, Dannible contacted staff that the reference made by M. Klimkiewicz of the public benefit (\$120,000), was in error. The correct proposed public benefit is \$32,700.*

3/14/22

Mike Klimkiewicz: Correct, everyone except the last one closest to the road is not there

Rich Berkowitz: Is there a way to move that in, I mean it looks like its abutting the fence

Mike Klimkiewicz: Yes , absolutely Rich ,we are going to turn it sideways and slide it over, it was put in that place because we wanted to fill in the entire lot, but since that's shrunk down , yes it will be slid over and its proper site distance from the other building .

Richard Harris: Mike those were part of the last time you came in for an expansion, 4 or 5 years ago right?

Mike Klimkiewicz: That's correct, they've been in place for at least 5 years now

Richard Harris: When you got the expansion from the Town?

Mike Klimkiewicz: That's correct all of these.

Don Roberts: Okay anyone else? Okay I think we should have a public information meeting on this okay.

Rich Berkowitz: I make a motion to have a public information meeting on April 25th.

Mike Ziobrowski: Ill second

Don Roberts: All in favor aye? (All in favor) Opposed? (None were opposed) Motion carried, see you on the 25th.

Joe Dannible: Thank you.

Crescent Commons PDD – PDD Recommendation

TABLED/REFERRED TO AGENCIES/PUBLIC HEARING SET. Board received presentations on the independent

Charlie Lucia: I make a motion to Adjourn

John Higgins: Ill second it.

Don Roberts: All in favor aye? (All in favor) Opposed? (None were opposed) Motion carried, thank you, good night, be safe.