

Town of Halfmoon Planning Board

January 8, 2007 Minutes

Those present at the January 8, 2007 Planning Board meeting were:

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

Alternate

Planning Board Members: Bob Beck
Jerry Leonard

Senior Planner: Jeff Williams
Planner: Lindsay Zepko

Town Attorney: Lyn Murphy

Town Board Liaisons: Mindy Wormuth
Walt Polak

CHA Representative: Mike Bianchino

Mr. Watts opened the January 8, 2007 Planning Board Meeting at 7:00 pm. Mr. Watts asked the Planning Board Members if they have reviewed the December 11, 2006 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the December 11, 2006 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried. Mr. Berkowitz abstained due to his absence from the December 11, 2006 Planning Board Meeting.

Public Hearing:

06.174 PH Frechette Subdivision, 143 Upper Newtown Road – Minor Subdivision

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. Gil VanGuilder of Gilbert VanGuilder & Associates, stated the following: The property consists of 6-acres of land which is located on the easterly side of Upper Newtown Road and ¼ mile south of Pohl Drive. The proposal is to subdivide the parcel into 4-lots. This proposal was before the Zoning Board of Appeals for approval of a second flaglot and a variance was granted. We are showing individual wells on each lot because the public water that was installed last year in the front of the property is not ready for connection. If the developer moves ahead, he can install the wells, as the lots are large enough. However, the thought is that they will wait to connect to the public water. There would be individual septic systems on the lots. As per a condition of the ZBA's approval,

a turnout has been added to the plan. The turnout was added to allow emergency vehicles to pass each. Mr. Watts asked if anyone from the Public wished to speak. Mr. Stan Sala, of Upper Newtown Road, asked the following: What is the minimum size lot for a single-family lot. Mr. Williams stated the following: With public water and public sewer 20,000 SF is the minimum lot size. With private water and private septic the minimum lot size is 40,000 SF, which is just under an acre of land. Mr. Sala asked what the setbacks were for drainage. Mr. Williams stated the side yard setback is 10 FT, the front yard setback is 50 FT and the rear yard setback is 30 FT. Mr. Sala stated the property was all clay and he did feel there would be adequate drainage. Mr. VanGuilder stated the following: The lots were approximately 150 FT wide and the average home today would be 55 FT wide, so this would leave about a 50 FT side yard on each side for the 4 single-family homes. The initial proposal was for 2-family homes, but the developer has reconsidered that. Mr. Watts asked Mr. VanGuilder to pass along Mr. Sala's concerns to the developer. Mr. VanGuilder stated that he would. Mr. Watts closed the Public Hearing at 7:08 pm. Mr. Berkowitz asked where the wetlands would drain. Mr. VanGuilder stated the following: There are 2 culverts where one part of the property would drain toward Upper Newtown Road and the other part of the property would drain toward the east. Mr. Berkowitz asked if the drainage would go to the wetlands across Upper Newtown Road. Mr. VanGuilder stated yes, there is a culvert at each location under the road. Mr. Higgins asked if the perk tests were performed. Mr. VanGuilder stated yes, Lansing Engineering has done the perk tests on the property and they were satisfactory. Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the Frechette minor subdivision. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried.

New Business:

07.001 NB Miranda Real Estate Group Inc., 28 Corporate Drive – Change of Tenant

Mr. Mark Peterson, the commercial manager for Miranda Real Estate, stated the following: We are proposing to open an office at 28 Corporate Drive. They would occupy 2,600 SF of office space. We would have 8 full-time employees and 4 to 5 part-time employees. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Williams if there was adequate parking available. Mr. Williams stated yes. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Peterson if they would still utilize their other site on Route 9. Mr. Peterson stated yes, temporarily until we get the process of the new building going. Mr. Higgins asked the applicant if they were going to have a sign. Mr. Peterson stated no, not at this point.

Mr. Berkowitz made a motion to approve the change of tenant application for Miranda Real Estate Group Inc. Mr. Ruchlicki seconded. Motion carried.

07.002 NB Northeast Mobile Detailing, LLC, 15 Dunsbach Road – Change of Tenant

Mr. Rick Young, the applicant, stated the following: We have taken over an old detail shop that is currently at 15 Dunsbach Road and we would be doing the same type of work. Mr. Watts asked what the hours of operation would be. Mr. Young stated 8:00 am to 5:00 pm six days a week. Mr. Watts asked if they would have 1 part-time employee. Mr. Young stated he would be a full-time employee and he would have 1 part-time person. Mr. Watts asked if they would be able to operate with only 7 vehicles at the site. Mr. Young stated the following: This is what the past rules were at the old detail shop and this is what the owner told me. Basically, when we get the cars done they go right out or the dealers come to pick the cars up within a day. Mr. Young stated if possible, we would like to change the limit on the number of cars allowed at this site. Mr. Watts stated there is not a stamped site plan of this site on file. Mr. Young stated

the owner of the property was supposed to be at tonight's meeting and she has not provided me any papers yet. Mr. Williams asked if the Master Engine repair shop was still operational at this site. Mr. Young stated no. Mr. Williams asked if the site was currently vacant at this time. Mr. Young stated yes, the site is all one building with 4 bays. Mr. Nadeau stated when the Board looked at this site at the last approval; we were looking to keep it low-key because it is in a residential area. Mr. Watts stated the following: The Board would require a site plan for this property. One of the issues that we have had in the past is there were no site plans provided and things were operating a little more informally and we have had issues relative to these places without approvals. We have since adopted policy where people have to provide us with a site plan. Once we have a stamped site plan, we can make sure that the business that is operating has parking shown on the site plan and there are no intrusions on other properties. Mrs. Murphy stated the following: Because we do not have a site plan filed, there is no basis upon which to go forward with an enforcement proceeding. For example if we do not have a stamped site plan showing that only 7 vehicles are allowed in a designated area at the site, we could not enforce this if vehicles were placed in another area and there were more vehicles on site than what was allowed. Mr. Watts stated if the owner does not have a site plan, then one would need to be done before the Board could proceed with this application. This item was tabled for the applicant to produce a professional site plan and the Board stated there would be a limit of 7 outside stored vehicles allowed on-site.

07.003 NB Watkins Plaza of Halfmoon, 1675 Route 9 - Sign

Mr. Tim Prescott, of Ray Sign Inc., stated the following: The existing sign was built about 10 years ago with a changeable copy area. The applicant would like to replace an area of the sign in order to place tenant panels on the freestanding sign. The size would remain the same as the existing signage.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the Watkins Plaza sign application contingent upon the applicant obtaining a building permit for the new signage. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

07.004 NB Nuance - A Boutique Salon, 1383 Vischer Ferry Road – Change of Tenant

Mr. Watts stated to the applicant that there is no site plan on file for 1383 Vischer Ferry Road. Ms. Holly Garofano, the applicant, stated the following: The owner of the building is going to provide the site plan for this application. I have submitted a drawing for this site. Mr. Watts stated that the Planning Department did have the drawing but they would need a professional site plan for this project. I would like to open a hair salon at this location. There would be 4 part-time employees. The hours of operation would be Tuesday through Thursday 9:00 am to 8:00 pm, Friday 9:00 am to 6:00 pm and Saturday 9:00 am to 3:00 pm. The 4 part-time employees would work a varied schedule and no more than 3 stylists would work during any one shift. Mr. Watts asked the applicant to provide a site plan for this property. Mr. Roberts asked the applicant if she had a sign application. Ms. Garofano stated she would submit a sign application for the next meeting.

This item was tabled for the applicant to provide a professional site plan.

07.005 NB Vosburgh PDD Office Bldg., 1 Vosburgh Road - Sign

Mr. Bruce Tanski, the applicant, stated the following: We would like to place a sign at the Vosburgh PDD Office Building with 3 tenant panels. The sign would be an 80 SF monument

sign. Mr. Roberts asked how the sign would be lighted. Mr. Tanski stated the sign would not be lighted.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the sign application for the Vosburgh PDD Office Building contingent upon the applicant obtaining a building permit and the sign is not placed in the right-of-way. Mr. Berkowitz seconded. Motion carried.

07.006 NB Harvest Bend, Smith Road & Hidden Farm Lane - Sign

Mr. Gerry Magoolaghan, of Belmonte Builders, stated the following: We would like to place a sign at the entrance of Harvest Bend residential development located off of Smith road. This sign would be similar to the signs they have placed on Farm to Market Road, Summit Hills and Prospect Meadows. Mr. Roberts asked if the sign would be 3 FT high. Mr. Magoolaghan stated the sign itself would be 3 FT high but it would be placed on pillars that would be higher than 3 FT. Mr. Ouimet asked at what entrance would the sign be placed. Mr. Magoolaghan stated the sign would be placed at the entrance closest to Farm to Market Road which is the first entrance coming from Farm to Market Road. Mr. Roberts asked how the sign would be lighted. Mr. Magoolaghan stated the sign would be placed on a fence and stonewall that would be flood lit. Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the sign application for Harvest Bend contingent upon the applicant obtaining a building permit, the sign is not placed in the right-of-way and the sign lighting does not shine into the roadway. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried.

07.007 NB Gas Turbine Parts & Services, Inc., 1 Old Route 146 – Addition to Site Plan

Mr. Fernando Robleno, the applicant, stated the following: I would like to add a building to our current site. I am proposing to build a 3,200 SF garage in the rear of the property. The building would be used for storage of vehicles and equipment. Mr. Berkowitz asked how close the proposed building would be to the existing homes in the area. Mr. Robleno stated it would be approximately 20 to 21 FT away from the current garage and I estimate it is another 30 FT away from the existing home. Mr. Berkowitz asked if the applicant is proposing a buffer in that area. Mr. Robleno stated the following: Most of that area was all wooded. The proposed garage would be used to store company vehicles, snow removal equipment, office furniture and lawn maintenance equipment. Mr. Higgins asked if the applicant had a retail dealer's license. Mr. Robleno stated the following: Yes, we do. Actually, the retail dealer's license was because we were trying to see if we could start a brokerage service. We do not have a dealer's license and we do not sell any vehicles from this site. Mr. Higgins stated the Board did not give the applicant an approval for this type of business. Mr. Robleno stated he did not know he had to get an approval for this type of work and he would take the sign down and cease doing that type of work until we discuss it with this Board. Mr. Higgins asked if any of their inventories would be stored in the proposed garage. Mr. Robleno stated the following: This business does not really have any inventories as the business is primarily like UPS and all their inventories are kept in our warehouse. The warehouse in Troy ships any inventory that is large and this location is not used for shipping purposes. Mr. Higgins asked if they would be clear cutting to the property line because we are concerned with not adversely affected the neighbors. Mr. Robleno stated the property is zoned commercially but it is primarily residential. They would keep as many trees as possible and we want to keep our building with the residential look. We would like to have the new proposed building look similar to our current building. We plan to use the same white vinyl siding. The garage would have windows and a front and a side door so it would have the appearance of a house. Mr. Ruchlicki asked if the backside of the building would be sided. Mr. Robleno stated yes, the entire building would have siding. Mr. Watts

stated the plans would need to show the proposed buffering to the residential areas. Mr. Higgins asked what the setback requirements were between residential use and commercial use. Mr. Williams stated the Town ordinance states there is required buffering when two different zoning districts abut each other. Mr. Robleno submitted an abstract of the proposed building to the Planning Board.

This item was tabled and the Board asked the applicant to buffer the proposed garage.

07.008 NB Pointe West Town Homes of Halfmoon/Fellows PDD, Fellows Road - Sign

Mr. Bruce Tanski, the applicant, stated the following: The Planning Board previously approved this sign for Pointe West Town Homes of Halfmoon. All dimensions and design of the sign are the same as the August approval. We are now proposing to relocate the sign out of the Town's right-of-way so we would not require an easement.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the sign application for Pointe West Town Homes of Halfmoon contingent upon the applicant obtaining a building permit, the sign is not placed in the right-of-way and the sign lighting does not shine into the roadway. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

Old Business:

06.112 OB Shops of Halfmoon, Route 9 & Route 146 (Star Plaza) – Commercial Site Plan

Mr. Bruce Tanski, the applicant, stated the following: Mr. Scott Lansing, of Lansing Engineering, was unable to attend tonight's meeting so he would present the commercial site plan project to the Board. In early January I had a meeting with the Town to go over some of the issues that CHA had presented. We have reduced these comments to about 4 or 5 comments that Mr. Bianchiano has sent to the Town dated January 5, 2007. We have met with Mr. DiPasquale from the County Sewer District and we are confident that we do have capacity. Mr. DiPasquale will provide this information to the Town in writing. We are proposing 2 buildings; one building would be 13,000 SF and the other building would be 9,100 SF. Mr. Tanski submitted an abstract of the proposed Rite Aide Pharmacy building to the Planning Board. CHA has stated that most of the stormwater issues have been resolved. We have a couple of outstanding issues with calculations and we are in correspondence with the Key Bank on a connection. I am currently in negotiation with a major tenant for a restaurant building and if we do come to agreement with this tenant, there would only be one restaurant building because they will need more parking. I would like to get the approval for the pharmacy and the site plan for 2 of the buildings and not the restaurants if this is possible. I have gone to the Zoning Board of Appeals to obtain a variance on an addition to Snyder's Restaurant and it was my understanding that this constituted an approval, which I recently found out that it didn't, so this is another issue that he would like to address at a later time. If we do put the addition on Snyder's we would lose the parking in the front where the State Police and Sheriff's park as this would become green space. Mr. Higgins stated that a previous approval for the Snyder's Restaurant they were going to eliminate the parking in the front. Mr. Tanski stated it is his understanding that we do not have an approval on Snyder's. Mr. Watts stated the following: Mr. Tanski did not come back to the Planning Board after he received an approval from the ZBA. The addition to Snyder's Restaurant is now part of the build-out to this project. Mr. Tanski stated Snyder's would be the last building that they do and they would make this building look like the rest of the buildings in the Shops of Halfmoon. Mr. Higgins asked if they have land-banked parking spaces along Old Route 146. Mr. Tanski showed on the plans where

the parking spaces would be land-banked; along Route 9, Route 146, Old Route 146 and near a 4-way intersection and the proposed Pharmacy drive-through. Mr. Higgins asked if the parking spaces closest to Snyder's were land-banked. Mr. Tanski stated no, they were not land-banked. Mr. Bianchino stated the following: At a meeting we did review the plans that were submitted and we sent a letter last week and there are some things that are still outstanding. They need a sign-off from the Sewer District, NYSDOT, curb cuts on Route 9, and a lighting plan. Mr. Tanski stated it is his understanding that the lighting plan is the only item that was not done and if possible, he would like to get an approval contingent on that because we had some issues with the lighting engineer. Mr. Bianchino stated that they did submit some information on stormwater management but they did address the rest of our comments. Mr. Nadeau asked Mr. Tanski if he was looking for a site plan approval. Mr. Tanski stated yes. Mr. Nadeau stated he did not see how they could give the site plan approval when we don't know which restaurant is coming in. Mr. Tanski stated the following: The parking was set up for 2 restaurants and it is his understanding that they meet the zoning on these 2 restaurants and the 2 restaurants are 5,600 SF each. Obviously, if we get a restaurant such as the Texas Roadhouse or an Olive Garden that would require a 9,000 or 10,000 SF building, we would not be able to put 2 restaurants in. We would have to come back to the Planning Board and reassess this whole situation. Mr. Nadeau asked Mr. Tanski if the restaurant square footage would change if there were one restaurant or two? Mr. Tanski stated that was correct because the restaurants can't be any more than the total of 11,200 SF because we do not have the parking. Mr. Berkowitz asked if 11,200 SF would be the maximum square footage of a restaurant they would have. Mr. Tanski stated that was correct. Mr. Watts asked if it would be Mr. Tanski's guess that the one restaurant would be less than what is portrayed there? Mr. Tanski stated they were currently in negotiations with a restaurant that probably wants a 9,000 SF building and the 2 separate restaurant buildings were 5,600 SF each. Mr. Polak stated he was not looking for land banking along Route 9; he was looking for green space in that area. Mr. Tanski stated there was still room to put green space between the land banking along Route 9 and it is our intent to put the green space in where the land banked parking is and if we have to remove it, we would remove it. Mr. Berkowitz asked if all the roofs would match. Mr. Tanski stated the people from Rite Aide said that they were open to negotiations as far as color because I told them I wanted to keep the earth tone colors. Mr. Tanski stated the picture of Rite Aide that he submitted to the Board was to show what the building would look like. Mr. Ruchlicki asked if the green roof and roof elevation is something that can be changed. Mr. Tanski stated that Bristish American did the rendering for me and they put a note on there that these colors were generic but I would like to keep with the earth tone colors. Mr. Higgins stated the following: There was a comment from the Town Engineer regarding the total density of the project with the amount of parking, the amount of retail space and everything else on the site and I have concerns with the access to the site and the parking. If you are successful with the one restaurant instead of two restaurants, than it will decrease the size by about 2,000 SF. It was mentioned that there would be a right in only at the bank and the engineer said that this was a requirement from the bank. Mr. Tanski stated the following: Yes, it was a requirement from the bank and we tried to make some changes to accommodate this because the bank has been at this site for a long time. To answer your questions, I think we meet all the zoning requirements for this piece of property. I know the density might be tight, but I think we meet the minimum requirements and I feel that the minimum is acceptable. This is an expensive piece of property that I have put a lot of time and money into and I need this to come to fruition to make it pay for itself. Mr. Higgins stated the following: I feel this project would be a benefit to the Town and an improvement to the entrance to the Town. However, I have

concerns with the traffic negatively impacting the traffic in that area. The traffic is already tough in that area. Mr. Tanski stated the following: There is no question about it, but we can't lose sight of the fact that we do have 3 traffic signals in the area. If you look at the situations that exist at Key Bank and we move the access down to the boulevard entrance, we will do away with a lot of issues and accidents that occur weekly. People would be able to egress and get in and out off of Old Route 146. Mr. Berkowitz stated the case is that this would make a bad situation better. Mr. Tanski stated the following: I would like to put a committee together to work on a sign because this is the entrance to Halfmoon and I would like it to be something that we could all be proud of. This site will be one of the nicest areas in Town. Mr. Berkowitz asked Mr. Tanski if this project were approved with contingencies on some of these factors, when would you know about the restaurant and the other outstanding issues. Mr. Tanski stated he may not know about the restaurant for 6 months or up to 2 years, but we are not going to do anything with these pads until somebody comes along. So, this may sit vacant until something happens because these will be land-leased buildings and we would have to come back to the Planning Board for an approval. Mr. Berkowitz asked what the construction time frame would be and demolition of the other buildings. Mr. Tanski stated that most of these buildings have been torn down and we are currently building a garage for Jay's Automotive, which hopefully will be done by the end of the month. British American wants to start right away in the spring so we can put the rear building up and relocate some of the buildings that are in the front to the back. There were some concerns with the Town when we built Jay's garage about the person in the house and that person has since moved out of the house and that house is vacant and it is up for rent now as a commercial establishment. Mr. Ruchlicki asked what could we expect to see in the area of the proposed restaurants as Mr. Tanski moves forward with this project and something doesn't happen in a year or two. Mr. Tanski stated that area would just be grass. Mr. Ouimet asked Mr. Tanski if he had DOT approval for any of the curb cuts on Route 9 or Old Route 146. Mr. Tanski stated we have gotten a verbal commitment from the DOT as to everything we want to do. Mr. Ouimet asked what Mr. Tanski needed to get a written approval from the DOT. Mr. Tanski stated what work we are going to do inside of here is basically private and we won't start this until the building is up. I have a commitment with the bank and a certain amount of days to do this but obviously we can't start until we get the permit from DOT. Mr. Watts asked when Mr. Tanski went to the DOT to approach this topic. Mr. Tanski stated about a year and half ago and that Mr. Watts was privy to one of the meetings and Mr. Watts talked to the DOT. Mr. Watts stated that was correct. Mr. Berkowitz asked if there was a letter pending from the DOT and when they expected a formal approval or sign-off. Mr. Tom Johnson, of Creighton-Manning Eng., stated the following: There were one or two minor issues that the DOT is expecting us to address as well as one or two comments from CHA. The general concept was that the DOT was in favor of moving the driveways away for the general overall plan. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Tanski if he feels this plan would be approved by the DOT and he would obtain the DOT permit. Mr. Tanski stated yes. Mr. Berkowitz asked if the County has approved this plan. Mr. Williams stated the County's general comment was with the DOT curb cuts and their approval. Mr. Tanski stated no construction would begin until they receive the permits. Mr. Nadeau asked if this Board does approve this project and there are issues with the DOT or for whatever reason they couldn't be accommodated, where would it leave this Board and the Town in the issue of approving the project. Mrs. Murphy stated the following: The applicant would not be able to proceed because he wouldn't be able to access the building and I am assuming you are saying that you would do the approval contingent upon the approval of the DOT and contingent upon confirmation of the sewer capacity. If those two contingencies were not met, the applicant

could not go forward. I would like to point out that if the Board approves this site plan, the applicant would be allowed to proceed with two separate restaurants without coming back to the Board. If the applicant wanted to modify the site plan to one restaurant, then he would have to come back to the Board. Mr. Watts stated he feels with the contingencies the Board should be okay but our preference would be to have one restaurant because the two restaurants would make the site tight with the parking. Mr. Tanski stated he is hoping to go with the one restaurant and this would definitely reduce the parking and reduce the size of the building. Mr. Watts stated the following: I recognize that this plan fits the zoning but a lot of things fit zoning and we don't approve everything just because it fits, we approve it because it's good and that safety and health issues are addressed. I see that this plan has come a long way from the original application and the concerns of the Town Board and Planning Board have been met. I would like to speak with the Rite Aide people to look at the architecture of the building. The representative from Rite Aide stated okay.

Mr. Berkowitz made a motion to approve the commercial site plan for the Shops of Halfmoon contingent upon NYSDOT, County Sewer and CHA's sign-off. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Berkowitz made a motion to grant a Neg. Dec. to SEQR. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried.

06.128 OB Adirondack Basement Systems, 4 Jones Road – Change of Tenant & Site Plan

Mr. Kevin Koval, President of Adirondack Basement Systems, stated the following: We have submitted a site plan that has been reviewed and modified several times. I feel that we have addressed all the concerns of the Board. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Williams if he had visited the site. Mr. Williams stated the following: I did visit the site with Mr. Greg Stevens, Director of Code Enforcement, and they are slowly filling in the proposed driveway, the trailer has been removed from the site and the gravel area has been returned to grass. Although the applicant is trying to get the site in order, the site is still cluttered. Mr. Koval stated they haven't gotten very far with making improvements because they haven't received an approval to do so. Mr. Williams stated that the applicant has produced a curb cut permit from the DOT and CHA has signed-off on the site. Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Watts if the applicant should be given a time frame on doing the rest of the clean up of the site. Mr. Koval stated the following: I do not have a problem with this because we would need some time to clean up the site because this isn't really the time of year when this could be done. The DOT is requiring that we pave the apron to the curb cut. Obviously we can't blacktop at this time, as the blacktop plants are not open. It will also take some time to fill in the rest of the parking area at the far end of the site and we can do the buffering as soon as the weather breaks this spring. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Koval when he could have this work completed. Mr. Koval stated he could have the buffering completed by May and we would continue to fill-in the driveway with clean concrete material that we remove from jobsites and put crush and run over the top of the concrete and this parking area is not pertinent to the operation that we run. The site plan that we submitted was for future expansion of parking. Mr. Watts asked what there was going to be at the end of the site. Mr. Koval stated the following: The area at the end of the site is currently being used for storage of the crushed stone. Currently this area is wooded and as we fill the area in, we will be removing trees and will be moving it further back as we move along. So for right now the area would remain overgrown down to the corner of Jones Road and Crescent Road and when the area is completely filled we will then put down the crush and run stone. Mr. Polak suggested that there be some green space in that area instead of all the parking because of the other

residences. Mr. Koval stated the following: Mr. Sicko, one of the residents in the area, asked that we didn't do any green space and he did not want any buffering. Another neighbor parks his truck in the area and he throws his garbage out of the truck and I clean up that garbage and this has been an ongoing process for me to keep that area clean. I have not heard any concerns from the neighbors except for Mr. Sicko. Mr. Watts stated he would have Mr. Williams talk to the neighbors regarding this issue. Mr. Higgins stated the applicant should be aware that no boat storage is allowed on this site. Mr. Koval stated okay.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the change of tenant application and site plan for Adirondack Basement Systems contingent upon the NYSDOT curb cut and the landscape buffer is placed by May 1, 2007 and the parking lot is to be completed by September 3, 2007 and no boat storage would be allowed on-site. Mr. Higgins seconded. Motion carried.

06.163 OB Boni – Route 146 PDD, Route 146 – Concept-Commercial Site Plan/PDD

Mr. Kevin Dailey, Atty., is representing Mr. Boni for a commercial site plan. Mr. Dailey stated the following: Mr. Boni, the property owner, and Mr. Tom Johnson, Of Creighton-Manning Engineer, are also present for tonight's meeting. When we were last before the Board in May 2006, the Planning Board asked us to do a couple of things. The Planning Board asked us to show them what we would envision this project to be at full build out. We did a traffic study based on the full build-out scenario so we would have something to measure. We went through several re-drawings with Scott Lansing's office. We finally came up with a plan that we feel is a good plan. We would hope that Planning Board would accept this plan as a guide of what might be possible in terms of road layouts, what the project could look like and Mr. Johnson will discuss the traffic impacts. I would like to hit upon some of the high points of the plan. We have 225,000 SF set aside for a major health care medical facility with a parking garage. We have taken the core of the remaining upland areas and have come in with some larger buildings from what we previously had shown. The larger buildings are reflective of the fact that the Town Board has asked us to consider as a public benefit building a north/south connector road from opposite Werner Road to a point where it would connect with the future plan east/west corridor roadway of the Town. We looked at this not as a public benefit but as a public necessity for public safety. However, we did not want to find ourselves in a position of not having enough square footage in the project overall to be able to sustain the expense that would be associated with building that kind of a highway. We show a base square footage of buildings so that we would have an economic model that would work and we feel we are at that point and I wrote a letter to the Town Supervisor last week with a copy to Mrs. Wormuth and Mrs. Murphy. Basically it was an offer saying that we would offer to build this road at an appropriate time when the design and when the Town knows exactly where they want the road to go and we would offer to put up a letter of credit until such time when the Town knows exactly what it wants to do. We do realize that this could be three, four or even five years in the future. We also know that it is important to the Town to look at anything that is built in the Route 146 corridor. We realize that the Town Government has taken a long hard look at the corridor and the overlay zones. We realize that anything that is added in terms of buildings produces traffic and the Town is concerned with the traffic impact not only on Route 146 but measuring out in each direction to the major intersections. Mr. Johnson, of Creighton-Manning Engineer, stated the following: We have conducted a traffic study for this project and I was asked to touch on some of the conclusions of the study. Our study area was on intersections along Route 146, from Route 9 down to Route 236 and then down Route 236 to Fellows Road and Harris Road. Because there are two distinct components to the project we analyzed the

impacts in two phases. Phase I – the 225,000 SF hospital and Phase II – the full build out phase, which then added an additional 450,000 SF of medical office building and medical office use. Phase I had minimal traffic impacts. The hospital will generate just over a couple hundred trips for each of the AM and PM peak hour. By the time you split that into different directions along Route 146, the amount of traffic at each intersection would be less than what the DOT would typically require for their own review. Meaning that there would be less than one hundred trips in any one-intersection approach. The improvements are limited to the site driveways. There are 2 site driveway access points that are proposed for Phase I; a western and eastern site access. The western site access is where we would anticipate most of the traffic coming from Route 9; we recommend that be controlled by a stop sign. However, we do think that a traffic signal will eventually be warranted at that intersection. However, at this time we could not find any information regarding the daily traffic that the hospital would generate in a course of a day. So we recommend that the intersection of the western site driveway be monitored for the installation of a traffic signal. For each of the driveways coming out of this site in Phase I, we recommend single lane approaches to Route 146 and at this point, no improvements to Route 146. We did recommend an improvement at the intersection of Route 146 and Route 236 but this was an improvement that was basically needed for no-build conditions to handle growth that is happening in the Town regardless of whether or not this project goes forward. As part of our study we included in our no-build condition traffic generated from an additional 11 other projects that are currently going through an approval process from the Town. All the traffic from those developments through the intersection of Route 146 and Route 236 and there is going to be traffic impacts and at this intersection. We recommend the installation of a northbound left turn lane on Route 236 be constructed. The applicant has agreed to participate in a fair share agreement for the improvement at that intersection. Again, this is not a result of this one project. For Phase II of this project for full build-out of additional 450,000 SF of medical office buildings the access analysis did change. The western site driveway remained the same and the eastern site driveway would be connected through a north/south connector road opposite Werner Road West. Mr. Ruchlicki stated he looked through the traffic study and did not find where they show the realignment of Werner Road West and the elimination of Werner Road East and the realignment of Fellows Road. Mr. Johnson stated the following: This would be in any of the figures that are called full build-out in the traffic study. The first one is on figure 3.6, which is a full build-out trip distribution. Mr. Ruchlicki asked if the collector road on the east side of the project site would be functional at that time. Mr. Dailey stated it would be eliminated. Mr. Johnson stated the dotted lines represent the new access to get from the project to go to the collector road. Mr. Dailey stated the following: This is one of the things that the Town Board did with their overlay zone because there is a desire to only have one curb cut per property. So, we would need the main entrance into the hospital but once the collector road is built and this would bring the road opposite Werner Road. We could make connections with either the cul-de-sac or the back entrance. At this point we could eliminate the eastern entrance and be faithful to the Town's overall plan for this corridor and we would do whatever would work best for the Town. Mr. Berkowitz asked what would the AM/PM peak hour trip generator be in Phase I. Mr. Johnson stated the peak AM was 260 and PM was 270. Mr. Berkowitz asked how many employees there would be in the 5-story hospital. Mr. Johnson stated he was not aware of this number. Mr. Berkowitz stated he believes all these employees would be coming at the AM peak hour. Mr. Johnson stated this information would be accounted for in the trip generation estimates. Mr. Berkowitz stated if they don't know how many employees there would be in the hospital how could they account for this figure. Mr. Johnson stated the number was based on square

footage. Mr. Berkowitz asked if this would be consistent with the number of beds in the hospital and what kind of services there would be instead of the square footage. Mr. Johnson stated the following: There were different variables that you could use to estimate the trip generation and because we don't have that information available, the square footage would be the most reliable at this point. You can also estimate based on occupied beds and also employees. Mr. Berkowitz stated they would have to take into consideration the ancillary staff and the professional staff that would be going to the hospital to see the patients. Mr. Johnson stated the following: This would also be included in the trip generation estimate. When we do studies for trip generation, all the traffic, regardless of the use, is included in that sort of number. Mr. Berkowitz stated that Mr. Johnson stated he did not know how many employees would be in the hospital. Mr. Johnson stated the following: This was correct, but when we do trip generation, it is based on actual traffic counts at hospitals. So, even though it is based on square footage, if you are a doctor, a nurse or somebody coming to visit the hospital for whatever use, you are included in that traffic count. For this case it is just applied against a square footage estimate. Mr. Berkowitz asked if the count was based on another hospital. Mr. Johnson stated yes, this is correct. Mr. Nadeau asked why this site along with the Fellows Road PDD does not require a traffic signal because when Creighton-Manning did the traffic analysis for the PDD on Fellows Road, we had concerns of needing a traffic light on that eastern entrance and I think at that point CME stated that it was very close to triggering a traffic signal but at that time it wouldn't be needed. Mr. Johnson stated the following: I believe with this project a traffic signal would be warranted. My concern is there is no data to say that it will be over 8 hours of a day, which is what DOT is going to look at. DOT will look at 8 separate hours of the weekday to see if the traffic volume is sufficient enough to warrant a signal. We think the traffic signal will be warranted for the hospital because of all the doctor visits and people coming to visit people at the hospital. Initially it would be controlled by a stop sign and once it is up and running, an after study would be done to determine what the traffic volumes are over a course of day. At that time they could see if it would warrant a traffic light for installation. Mr. Berkowitz asked if the people leaving the site during the PM peak hour would have difficulty making a left hand turn onto Route 146 at the stop sign. Mr. Johnson stated these people would have to wait for a gap, which would be difficult to make especially in the PM peak hour. Mr. Nadeau stated it would be difficult at both the AM and PM peak hours. Mr. Dailey stated the following: They would be posting a letter of credit for utilities, roadways and things of that nature. We would be very happy to increase the amount of the letter of credit to include the cost of a traffic signal. So, if the traffic signal is warranted, the money has been set aside. Mr. Berkowitz asked why they would wait to install the traffic signal if they know they would need it. Mr. Johnson stated the following: The question of the signal right now would only be based on two hours a day in the AM and PM peak. This is the way the DOT operates and they wouldn't want to install a signal for one hour a day. The DOT wants to see traffic volumes over the course of 8 separate hours of the day and those are the primary warrants. Mr. Berkowitz asked how many hours in a day would trigger a traffic signal. Mr. Johnson stated the following: This would depend on what the warrant is as there are 11 different traffic signal warrants. And the one for right now would be called warrant 11 the peak hour 5 warrant. There are 3 or 4 other traffic signal warrants that are based on the traffic flow over 8 separate hours of the day. Mr. Berkowitz asked if the DOT consider that this is a hospital and you would have emergency vehicles going in and out of that hospital. Mr. Johnson stated yes, the DOT would consider this. Mr. Watts asked if they have had any conversations with anybody from the DOT relative to the issues that we have raised. Mr. Johnson stated no. Mr. Watts asked when this might occur. Mr. Johnson stated the study was just released and it would probably occur very soon. Mr.

Watts stated these are evident concerns that should be relayed to the DOT. Mr. Dailey stated if the DOT will let us put a traffic signal up and they say we meet the warrants, we would put in a traffic signal. Mr. Johnson stated the following: In our traffic analysis we do show conditions assuming that a traffic signal is there, just to show how much better it would operate. But again in our dealings with the DOT, it is what are the volumes over 8 hours of an individual day. So, we stop short of saying, "put it in now". The DOT may say "okay, we agree with you in this location because it is a hospital, then put it in now and don't wait until monetary". Mr. Berkowitz asked if they knew whether the DOT would be proactive or reactive. Mr. Johnson stated he did not know. Mr. Higgins stated the following: In one statement the project is a hospital and in another statement it is a health care facility. If you don't know what is going to be, how can you accurately determine what the traffic study would be? Mr. Johnson stated the following: Based on what the land scenarios that we are analyzing, we have very good trip generation information for hospitals and for medical office buildings. Based on those two land uses, we can accurately depict on what will happen. Mr. Higgins stated that Mr. Johnson stated he did not have any idea how many employees would be in that building. Mr. Johnson stated this is because all of our estimates are based on square footage and that is another variable that is used most often in estimating trip generation. Mr. Watts asked if this project was going to be a hospital. Mr. Dailey stated the following: I have been told the project would include a 24 hour fully staffed emergency room as you would find in any top grade hospital. With a major emphasis on a trauma unit, a stroke unit and a cardiac care unit. In addition, to expect 120 beds with an emphasis on women's health care, neonatal, maternity and pediatrics. There has been study done of health care needs in the Capital Region from Plattsburgh, Utica and into Massachusetts and down to Poughkeepsie. The study assigned a different colored dot to the place of origin of each patient and a different colored dot for the medical discipline involved. When looking at the different colored dots for the women's health care issues, the center point from where those patients come from is Southern Saratoga County and in particular, the Town of Halfmoon. So it is a question of moving the services closer to where the patients are. This seems to be the game plan and this is what I have been told so far. Mr. Watts stated the following: The Board is recognizing in this entire scenario that the hospital and medical campus is what you are proposing and you would require a certificate of need issued by the State Health Department. If the State Health Department does not approve this, then this whole scenario disappears as part of the contingencies of the PDD and an approval by the Town Board and the Planning Board. Mr. Dailey stated the following: I understand. I have a product relative to the additional square footage, which is considerable. We are showing attached to the hospital building and the garage 50,000 SF for doctor's offices. Since we were before the Board in May, there has been a lot that happened, such as, Luther Forrest, AMD, Albany Nanotech and possibly a major hospital that may be coming to Halfmoon. In the discussions that I have had, I was asked to consider putting aside some space for bio-medical research and I said "sure, how about 400,000 SF for bio-medical research?" and the answer is "we would be delighted to work on that with you". I have had the opportunity to run this plan by SEDC, we have met with the Center for Economic Growth in Albany and there is not only interest, but also enthusiasm for such a scenario. I met with Jack Kelly from SEDC and Supervisor DeCerce and they were very excited about this. When you consider what is going on with Luther Forrest and what they are doing at Albany Nanotech, this fits right in with the corridor study with what is happening in the Capital District. Really, the eyes of the world are on Saratoga County. We are excited about this addition for what we might be able to bring into the Town of Halfmoon. Mr. Higgins asked what they were going to do about the wetlands. Mr. Dailey stated the following: We have gone to extraordinary lengths to design this project around the wetlands. The

property has been delineated and the Army Corp of Engineers has accepted the delineation. I have talked to John Connell, ACOE, about this; I have met with Ken Kogut, DEC, and the staff of Region 5 in Warrensburg. They have looked at this plan and a letter has been generated advising us to do certain things relative to the use of the buffer zones or what are sometimes called the 100 FT transition zone. I believe that we can satisfy not only DEC, but ACEO in terms of use of the wetlands. We are showing impacts on the Federal Wetlands that are greater than what the nationwide permits would permit so we may have to go in with an individual permit for that. This is a guide and we will be working with that. Mr. Johnson stated the following: Phase II is the inclusion of the extra 450,000 SF of medical office and the big change is the access to Route 146 which would come east to the north/south connector road to a bigger intersection. We would recommend left turn lanes on Route 146 at the east and west bound approaches and also a couple lanes on the northbound approach of the collector road and also a traffic signal at that location. In Phase II the improvements would be made on Route 146. Mr. Polak asked build-out would be part of Phase II. Mr. Johnson stated yes, full build-out would be part of Phase II. Mr. Higgins asked if this included the traffic light. Mr. Johnson stated yes, we would recommend the traffic light. Mr. Berkowitz stated there are a lot of proposed parking garages that look like they are going to dwarf a lot of the 3-story buildings in Phase II and a couple of the garages are not even close to any of the office buildings. Mr. Dailey stated the following: The parking garages and probably all of the buildings will be in some kind of common ownership probably with long-term leases. They won't have their own particular parking lot. We show sidewalks that we know are important to the Town and I want to make it known for the record that we fully expect to add some trails and build sidewalks in this project to tie-in with what the Town is doing otherwise. We do not know exactly where all the Town's trails will be in this area of Town yet but I would assume we would lay those in and get some advice from the Town on where they would like them. Mr. Berkowitz stated they show the required parking as 1652 spaces and the total proposed parking garage is 2400 spaces, which is an excess of about 800 spaces. Mr. Dailey stated the following: On parking spaces they are going directly off the Town zoning law, we would expect to do that for the office buildings. We have talked to hospital architects about parking and the architects stated there is a standard for a hospital and it is different than what you would find for a commercial strip mall. When we were in discussion with CME relative to bio-medical research, a research facility would use much less parking and generate many fewer trips than a regular doctor's office. We tried to show the gross build-out at the higher end knowing that we had to do the traffic study and do it with some accuracy but actually what may be built at the end may be less. We try to give a couple different scenarios depending on what actually will be built there and we just don't know yet. Our preference at this point, if somebody wants to come along on the research end, we think this is the highest and best use and may be the best thing for the Town. There was an article in the Times Union about stem cell research and some of the breakthrough. Governor Spitzer has announced that he plans to pursue 2.1 billion dollars for stem cell research in New York State. If we have a location for some of that, we want to be first in line. Mr. Watts stated the following: They have heard the issues of traffic, issues of where the roads would be and wetland issues and questions. This is a large project and the largest project that we have seen. The project might go better with less numbers and during the phasing of the review process by CHA or the Town Board with the PDD, the numbers are the numbers. The proposed project that you have presented is a busy site. Mr. Dailey stated the following: We understand that. Our major concern is economically viability. Mr. Watts stated the following: We can work through the process in regards to the public benefit, etc. but as with any project, they are ambitious in the beginning and the key factor here is the hospital

and emergency room. The project has now developed further and I recognize the movements that have gone on and are going on and I think at this point, if the Planning Board is in agreement, is a referral to CHA. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Dailey if they would be providing the Board with any additional information relative to the site plan at this point. Mr. Dailey stated no sir.

This item was tabled and referred to CHA.

06.181 OB Howland Park PDD, 128 Johnson Road – Major Subdivision/PDD/GEIS

Mr. Matt Brobson, of Ivan Zdrahal Associates, PLLC, stated the following: At the December 11, 2006 Planning Board meeting some issues were raised regarding traffic issues with the McBride Road and Johnson Road intersection and some interest in the realignment of Johnson Road and we have addressed those issues. I would also like to talk about the public benefit for the project. We are proposing \$1,000 per lot as well as 1,600 linear feet of a multi-use trail way, which would run along the eastern end of the site along McBride Road and would continue to the A & M Sports Complex property. The proposed multi-use trail way on Adam's Pointe would be shifted which is approximately 900 linear feet which would be incorporated in this project. There would be addition of 20 FT along the entire length of Johnson Road frontage for additional right-of-way to the Town for potential future realignment of the road. Also, we have added the temporary emergency access road from Johnson Road, which would be 16 FT wide and would be able to support the weight of 50,000 lb. emergency vehicles. If there is further development beyond this, the access could be removed. The yellow shown on the plans is the common open space, the beige color is land preservation area within the lots and the green color is the lot development area. The white color is the stormwater management areas. Mr. Higgins asked the reasoning behind the temporary emergency access road because you are taking what could be a nice esthetic area and putting a road through the middle of it for basically no reason. Mr. Brobson stated there was a concern to have a temporary access out of that area. Mr. Bianchino stated the applicant did not originally propose this, but some one from the Town requested that second point of access be provided temporarily until such time as the other land around it is developed and this is why the applicant has proposed this access. Mr. Berkowitz asked if this land could be developed because there are slopes and wetlands. Mr. Bianchino stated there is some land this it developable and development could be extended in the future. Mr. Higgins asked if the road was put in and it wasn't needed in the future would they remove the gravel and reseed the area. Mr. Brobson stated they would do this if the road were not to be extended in the future. Mr. Bianchino stated there is time to consider this, as this is probably a future phase anyway. Mr. Higgins stated if the Board approves this as it is shown, then we are locked into it.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to set a Public Informational Meeting for the January 22, 2007 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Higgins seconded. Motion carried.

06.195 OB Inglewood PDD, Cemetery Road – Major Subdivision/PDD

Gavin Vuillaume, of Environmental Design Partnership, stated the following: This project was last before the Board on November 27, 2006 at which time we had our Public Informational Meeting. We did receive some public comments as well as comments from the Planning Board at that meeting. The first concern raised at the meeting was the sight distance for the project and the second concern was vegetative screening and buffering around the parameter of the project. At the last meeting Creighton-Manning presented their findings from their original traffic report and at that time it was determined that the CME should revisit the site to look at

some of the current existing conditions. We have a lot of vegetation near of the frontage of the property along Cemetery Road along with a large barn, which is very close to the road. CME pointed out in their report that the existing sight distance for the entrance that we are proposing currently is not adequate and some vegetation would have to be removed. We have identified approximately 15 FT of area in the frontage of project where there is 20 to 25 large diameter trees along with smaller brush that would need to be removed in order to improve our sight distance. I believe the sight distance that is required for this project at 45 mph is approximately 450 FT. We would have this sight distance available to us with the removal of some of these trees. Many of the existing trees would remain and the trees would be flagged. The larger trees that would have to be removed would not be significant and we don't feel that it would alter the character of the rural roadway. Further detailed plans will be prepared to finalize the completion of the removal of these trees. Additional trees would be installed on the proposed roadways. We believe the sight distance can be achieved and at this time we are comfortable and CHA is fairly comfortable with the report that CME has prepared. We have received a letter from one of the neighbors, Ms. Denise Karwiel, who submitted a letter to the Planning Board with the concern that she wanted to have some additional privacy along her easterly property line. We have already committed to provide some additional landscaping for the Gilberts, who are on Cemetery Road and are surrounded on three sides by this project. Ms. Karwiel also asked if we would provide some additional screening and the applicant has met with Ms. Karwiel and they decided to put a stockade fence along her property line and I believe Ms. Karwiel is comfortable with this at this time. We are still continuing to work with the Town Board on the public benefit for this project. Currently we are proposing approximately \$60,000 to the Town to be use for playground equipment. This has not been finalized, but we will be talking to the Town Board to see if some of that money could be shifted for a traffic light at Cemetery Road now that the commercial project at the end of Cemetery Road is going to move forward. Mr. Ruchlicki asked who would maintain the area where the trees would be removed as that area becomes re-grown with bushes and undergrowth as this area would need to be free and clear for sight distance. Mr. Vuillaume stated a lot of that vegetation would occur within the existing right-of-way so we may want to extend that right-of-way a little further into the project so that the Town doesn't have to mow along the right-of-way like they continually do along other areas along Cemetery Road. There also would be a Homeowner's Association for this project that will be doing general maintenance. We will probably have some type of signage out front so that area would be landscaped as a lawn area around the signage. So it would be the responsibility of both the Homeowner's Association and may be the additional right-of-way that could be given to the Town for the maintenance. Mr. Ruchlicki asked if there was an electrical box in that area. Mr. Vuillaume stated yes, I believe that is for telephone. Mr. Ruchlicki stated that it looks like this would jut out considerably where the trees would be removed. Mr. Vuillaume stated it really doesn't, I would say about a couple of feet. Mr. Higgins asked what the sight distance would be looking south. Mr. Vuillaume stated it would be 450 FT in one direction and about 500 FT to the east from the intersection. Mr. Nadeau stated at the last meeting it was my understanding that the sight distance should be 500 FT and you could only come up with 460 FT so how does this meet the sight distance. Mr. Johnson stated with the existing vegetation, they do not have the 500 FT sight distance. Mr. Bianchino stated it was with the relocated curb cut they could get some value that was less than what is required and this was without removing any of the vegetation. Mr. Higgins asked if 450 FT was the required sight distance. Mr. Bianchino stated off the top of my head, I don't know. Mr. Higgins stated I agree with Mr. Nadeau as I believe the gentleman at the previous meeting stated that was the best that they could do even with the removal of the vegetation. Mr. Johnson stated the sight

distance is limited on the south side because of the barn. Mr. Higgins asked if this now meets the requirements or is that the best that can be done. Mr. Johnson stated I believe the recommendations give a range between 450 FT and 520 FT so we are at the bottom end of the requirement in one direction and we are fine with the other direction. Mr. Bianchino stated in my letter I indicated that with the vegetative removal we were okay with the sight distance. Mr. Johnson stated I believe the report stated that it was not critically limited and there is no necessity for signage as sometimes when you get below what is recommended they'll put signage up and I don't think we're to that point where we need signage. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Bianchino if CHA issues have been satisfied. Mr. Bianchino stated yes the comments have been addressed.

Mr. Nadeau made a motion to grant a position recommendation to the Town Board. Mr. Berkowitz seconded. Motion carried.

**06.240 OB Soft-Tex Mfg. Co., 428 Hudson River Road – Change of Tenant-
with Site Plan**

Mr. Bill Mafrici, of Hershberg and Hershberg, stated the following: We are the site engineers for this project. We have submitted a revised site plan and the only real change was the modification of the configuration of the parking spaces in the front of the building. It was recommended by CHA to revise the configuration of these parking spaces. As a result of this, it would increase the access and circulation within the loading areas. This plan reflects less land banking in the rear of the building and we are holding 13 parking spaces to be land banked in the front of the building. We are requesting an approval of the change of tenancy with the site plan approval. Mr. Watts asked Mr. Bianchino if CHA was all set with everything. Mr. Bianchino stated yes. Mr. Higgins asked which parking spaces were going to be land banked. Mr. Mafrici stated that there were 13 parking spaces in the front that are within the loading area that are going to be land banked and there are 16 spaces to the rear of the building on the northwest side that would be land banked.

Mr. Berkowitz made a motion to approve the change of tenant/site plan application for Soft-Tex Mfg. Co. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Berkowitz made a motion to adjourn the January 8, 2007 Planning Board Meeting at 9:07 pm. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
Milly Pascuzzi,
Planning Board Secretary