

Town of Halfmoon Planning Board

July 9, 2007 Minutes

Those present at the July 9, 2007 Planning Board meeting were:

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

Alternate

Planning Board Members: Bob Beck

Senior Planner: Jeff Williams

Town Attorney: Lyn Murphy

Town Board Liaisons: Paul Hotaling

CHA Representative: Bob Lockwood

Mr. Watts opened the July 9, 2007 Planning Board Meeting at 7:01 pm. Mr. Watts asked the Planning Board Members if they had reviewed the June 25, 2007 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Ruchlicki made a motion to approve the June 25, 2007 Planning Board Minutes. Mr. Higgins seconded. Motion carried. Mr. Roberts abstained due to his absence from the June 25, 2007 Planning Board Meeting.

Mr. Beck replaced Mr. Berkowitz in his absence.

New Business:

07.069 NB Allure Salon, 1675 Route 9 (J&S Watkins Plaza) - Sign

Mr. Tim Prescott, of Ray Sign, presented the sign application for Allure Salon. Mr. Prescott stated the following: Allure Salon wishes to replace the existing Miller Paint sign with a 25.5 SF, sign with channel letters and illuminated with neon. The lettering would be the same as all the other signage in the plaza. Mr. Roberts asked if the sign would have exposed neon. Mr. Prescott stated the neon would not be exposed and would have a Plexiglas face. Allure Salon would also be replacing the tenant panel on the existing freestanding sign with the same dimensions. Mr. Roberts stated the owner of the plaza should be aware that they are almost at maximum square footage of signage allowed at this site.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the sign application for Allure Salon. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried.

07.070 NB Tire Warehouse, 1428 Route 9 – Concept-Addition to Site Plan

This item was removed from the agenda – waiting for a revised site plan.

07.071 NB Pipino Subdivision, 17 Fellows Road – Minor Subdivision

Mr. Duane Rabideau, of Gilbert VanGuilder's & Associates, stated the following: I am representing Mr. Paul Pipino in his request to subdivide a 2.35-acre parcel of land into 2 duplex lots. The parcel is located on the north side of Fellows Road and about ¼ mile from Route 236. Lot A would be approximately 49,000 SF and Lot B would be approximately 53,000 SF. They are proposing to place a duplex unit on each lot. The parcels would have individual septic systems with public water. They would be utilizing the existing driveway and existing curb cut for a common drive for both lots. Both of the proposed duplex units would be set back so there would be minimal clearing. The reason for the common drive is to avoid any impacts to the wetlands in the front of the lots. Mr. Nadeau asked if the proposed septic systems would be close to adjacent lands. Mr. Rabideau stated the existing residence to the west is all wooded and Mr. Rousseau's property has a garage in the rear of his property and no improvements are proposed within 100 FT. Mr. Higgins asked what the width is of the existing drive. Mr. Rabideau stated it is approximately 12 FT. Mr. Higgins stated two cars would not be able to pass with the 12 FT width of the drive. Mr. Rabideau stated yes, that is correct. Mr. Higgins stated the drive should be wide enough to allow 2 cars to pass and for emergency vehicles. Mr. Rabideau stated one of the reasons we didn't think of this because it would be low impact and it is not like cars would stack in the area. Mr. Higgins stated they are proposing 4 residential units. Mr. Rabideau stated we could expand the drive. Mr. Higgins stated I am concerned that if one resident is coming in and one resident is going out that they have room to pass each other. Mr. Nadeau asked if a fire truck could access the site. Mr. Rabideau stated the 12 FT drive is a little narrow but once the fire truck is in the driveway it would be fine or the truck could remain on the road. Mr. Watts asked how far back were the duplexes from the road. Mr. Rabideau stated about 150 FT and the fire trucks carry 200 to 250 FT hose lines.

Mr. Nadeau made a motion to set a Public Hearing for the July 23, 2007 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Roberts seconded. Motion carried.

07.073 NB Craig A. Hayner/Town of Halfmoon Subdivision, 148 Route 236 – Minor Subdivision

Mr. Jeff Williams, Town of Halfmoon Senior Planner, presented the minor subdivision application for Craig A. Hayner/Town of Halfmoon. Mr. Williams stated the following: Craig and Carolyn Hayner own a 16.13-acre parcel on Route 236. The Hayner's farm stand/farm restaurant is located on this parcel. The Hayner's have come to an agreement with the Town of Halfmoon to sell off 10-acres to the Town which this plan represents. This would leave 6.13-acre parcel for the Lands of Hayner. The rear of this existing parcel would be conveyed to the Town of Halfmoon that is adjacent to the 51-acres that the Town owns for their active recreation park which the Town is currently in the process of developing. There are no proposed improvements to this 10-acre parcel as it stands.

Mr. Roberts made a motion to set a Public Hearing for the July 23, 2007 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried.

07.074 NB DeVoe's Rainbow Orchard, 1569 Route 9 – Addition to Site Plan

Mr. Larry DeVoe, the applicant, stated the following: I am proposing to construct a barn/warehouse. The plan shows the snack bar, house and garage. We are proposing to move

the garage in the future. Mr. Higgins asked if the parking area is striped on the existing sales and storage structure and asked how many parking spaces were at this site. Mr. DeVoe stated the following: I believe there is 7 parking spaces and that parking area is not striped because of the mulch piles and stone piles. The snack bar does have a striped parking area. Mr. Watts stated this was not shown on the plans. Mr. DeVoe stated correct, the lines for the parking are not shown on the plan but this is shown on the original plans that were approved in 2005. Mr. Watts stated the previous plan that this Board approved 2 years ago should be revised to show the new building. Mr. DeVoe stated this is essentially what we have done. Mr. Watts stated no you haven't because you don't show the parking as it was shown on the original site plan. *(Mr. Watts provided Mr. DeVoe with a copy of the original approved site plan for his review)*. Mr. DeVoe stated this is the plan that was approved 2 years ago. Mr. Watts asked Mr. DeVoe to submit a revised site plan showing the proposed new building and the size of the new building. Mr. DeVoe stated the following: At the time we did the original site plan 2 years ago, we were contemplating whether we would come back to the Board and propose an entirely new building for sales and storage. Since then the road has been widened the building would be too close to the road and we have lost some parking. A site plan that was approved in 1981 showed a 10,000 SF building instead of a 6,000 SF building. Mrs. Murphy stated the following: I think what I am hearing from the Board is in theory this is not a problem at all. On the original copy of the plan the dimensions of the building in the back are not accurate as to what you want to build. The Board may go forward conditioned upon the dimensions of the building are changed. Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the addition to site plan for DeVoe's Rainbow Orchard contingent upon the applicant submitting the 2005 approved site plan showing the correct dimensions and location of the 38 FT x 150 FT proposed pole barn. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

Old Business:

05.140 OB

**Guideboard Rd. Retail Bldg./Country Dollar Plaza, 217 & 225
Guideboard Rd.— Commercial Site Plan/Addition to Site Plan**

Mr. Joe Bianchine, of ABD Engineering, stated the following: I am representing Mr. Peter Vasilakos for the proposed commercial site plan and addition to site plan application. Mr. Vasilakos owns the property on the north side of Guideboard Road from Route 9 to Route 236. There is an existing NBT Bank on the corner of Route 9 and Guideboard Road and there is a vacant strip of land that he would like to develop next to the Wolberg building and the Country Dollar Plaza. The proposal is for a 15,050 SF retail plaza. The applicant also wishes to modify the parking in front of the Wolberg building and also modify the parking and the layout around the Country Dollar Plaza. The parking would be increased in one area and decreased in another area but would still meet the Town's regulations and exceed the parking regulations in another area. The County Dollar Plaza always had a deficit of parking and would still have a deficit but there would be more parking available than what is there now. The proposal is to move the existing entrance to line up with the Mobil Mart across the street. We are also requesting to have a right turn in only and a right turn out only to the west of the parcel that would need to be reviewed by CHA, Saratoga County and NYSDOT to see if this proposal would be a feasible location. To put everything through one curb cut could be somewhat problematic. We are not proposing any changes to the NBT Bank site. Mr. Vasilakos has made renovations to the Country Dollar Plaza and would keep the architecture the same for the proposed new retail building. We are proposing to have access in the rear of the new retail building with parking. Water and sewer are available to this site. Mr. Nadeau stated we have seen other proposals for this site and most of the Board was opposed to intense use at this site because of traffic

stacking in this area. Mr. Ruchlicki asked what the light green area represented on the plans. Mr. Bianchine stated that would be green in the future but it was done on the computer and this is the way it printed out. Mr. Roberts stated I agree with Mr. Nadeau but also with moving the existing access further toward the intersection of Guideboard Road and Route 236 could be a problem because at the current time traffic is stacking in that area. Mr. Bianchine stated correct, currently the stacking occurs in both directions. Mr. Nadeau asked where the entrance would be on the backside. Mr. Bianchine stated it was wide open all away through that area and we are trying to have 2 access points in the rear of the site for deliveries to the rear of the existing business at this site. Mr. Ruchlicki asked if this was something that could be incorporated in the layout and asked if there was a possibility of directing traffic in that direction. Mr. Bianchine stated yes, this is a possibility if that is something the Board would consider. Mr. Higgins asked if the rear of the site fronts on a Town road. Mr. Bianchine stated yes. Mr. Watts stated maybe it is not a bad idea to go that way. Mr. Roberts stated I disagree because we closed that off years ago for safety reasons. Mr. Watts asked if a traffic study had been done for this site. Mr. Bianchine stated no, not at this point. Mr. Nadeau stated we know what is located at this site and we know that currently there is too much there and we know this is a problem now. Mr. Bianchine agreed and asked what would be the best means of access because the traffic is already there. Mr. Watts stated yes, that is an issue and I know we have had discussions about the size of the building and how much traffic this might generate. Mr. Lockwood stated the following: We have been back and forth on this a few times already. As far as the site itself I do not see any issues there. How you would access the site is another issue as it is a tough site to access. Mr. Nadeau asked what types of retail business are proposed for this site. Mr. Bianchine stated at this point there is no proposed retail but they would try to find businesses that were different than those already at this site so the tenants are not competing against each other. Mr. Watts stated the following: One of the issues is what the tenant mix is now and the quality of these businesses at this site leads to more people wanting to go there. Currently there are good businesses at this site. Our issues with this proposal are somewhat with the size of the building and the traffic flow. I don't know if anyone on this Planning Board could resolve the traffic issues at this point without the project being referred to CHA for their review. Mr. Bianchine stated I would also like to be referred to the NYSDOT and Saratoga County DPW for their input. Mr. Lockwood stated agreed. Mr. Watts stated we would love to see some improvements at Guideboard Road. Mr. Bianchine stated the NYSDOT have been talking about doing things here for years. Mr. Lockwood asked if they were looking at any high volume tenants such as Starbucks or a Dunkin Donuts. Mr. Bianchine stated I don't think so at this point. Mr. Vasilakos stated there would be no fast food restaurants. Perhaps there would be something like doctor offices or real estate offices. Mr. Nadeau stated the proposed businesses at that site would have to be low-key. Mr. Watts stated you have heard our concerns and I think the suggestion of going to the NYSDOT and the Saratoga County is valid so we can get a feel for what is going to happen in this area. We know where the easements are on both sides of the road and we know that this is a busy intersection. Mr. Lockwood stated we could voice our opinion until we are blue in the face but it might not be something that the County or the State would buy into. Mr. Williams stated we have talked about conveying some extra width of land along Guideboard Road. Mr. Lockwood asked if Mr. Bianchine if he would show this easement on the plans. Mr. Bianchine stated yes. Mr. Ruchlicki asked if there were 3 separate parcels at this site. Mr. Bianchine stated yes. Mr. Ruchlicki asked if these parcels were combined it would give them a little more latitude as to what can happen with the parking in the way it is laid out. Mr. Bianchine stated yes, these parcels need to either be combined or redefined. Mrs. Murphy stated our statute actually

requires that if the same owner owns connecting parcels and if the Planning Board recommends a revised plan, it would help with the parking requirements. Mr. Vasilakos stated it was 5 parcels altogether. Mr. Nadeau asked if they had looked into downsizing the building. Mr. Bianchine stated we have not at this point. Mr. Watts stated that might be subject to downsizing as our engineer's review the project and what the Planning Board is saying is to consider this at this point.

This item was tabled and referred to CHA for review.

06.238 OB R.J. Valente (Halfmoon Materials Group), 118 Button Road – Site Plan

Mr. Dean Marotta, of R.J. Valente Gravel, presented the site plan application for R.J. Valente (Halfmoon Materials Group). Mr. Marotta stated the following: We have talked and the Board has asked us to update the site plan application with the proposed parking. The applicant wishes to construct a 7,925 SF office/garage building on the existing site of R.J. Valente gravel mine off of Button Road. There is an existing 966.41 SF one bay garage and the proposal is to construct a new structure which consists of a 2,400 SF office in the front and a three bay garage in the back that will have 14 FT doors for large equipment. The applicant is showing 10 parking spaces to be paved in front of the proposed building and a large gravel parking space behind the building. Mr. Watts stated the following: The reason why we brought you in was because there was a confusion and communication issue relative to whether or not the mine is controlled by the NYSDEC and whether or not the building was part of the mine permit process. At one point we believed it was and we learned later that it is not. Part of that process is that you submit a site plan for the Planning Board to review relative to the building and we need to formalize that process. Mr. Higgins asked if the major part of the proposed building would be used for truck repair. Mr. Marotta stated the following: Yes, it would all be used for truck repair. We have an existing one bay garage that we currently use and we also use the outside area. We are proposing to put a roof over the whole building. The applicant states the proposed garage is a temporary structure and would be removed when the mine is closed and the reclamation plan is put into effect. Mr. Higgins asked if the operation would be used for truck repair for trucks that use this pit. Mr. Marotta stated correct. Mr. Higgins asked if the truck repair facility would be open to the public and you would not bring any other trucks in to work on. Mr. Marotta stated the following: No, in fact we have other locations where we do repairs. Our work is jurisdictional which means if we are in Halfmoon, we will park those trucks in Halfmoon. If we have jobs in Albany, the trucks park in Albany. The majority of the truck traffic varies at this site as it is now. Currently we have about 20 trucks that park at this site. Sometimes the number of trucks gets down to 5 or 10 or can get as high as 25. The number depends on the work in the area. We would like to upgrade the area so the men don't have to work outside in the wintertime. The existing entrance will still be the truck entrance. There are two office workers, a comptroller, Ronnie and myself that will use another entrance and we would also park there. Mr. Ruchlicki asked if there was an existing sign at that entrance. Mr. Marotta stated yes. Mr. Nadeau asked if the existing building was located on the plans. Mr. Morotta stated no it is not. Mr. Nadeau stated we would need to see that on the plans and asked if that building would be removed once the new building goes up. Mr. Morotta stated the following: I believe so, yes. We have submitted several drawings and we have submitted a master plan that shows everything and the current plan best described the parking issues and the detention ponds. The first set of drawings did show the existing building. Mr. Nadeau asked if the current plan was the map that we would be using to give you a final approval. Mr. Marotta stated all the plans have stamps and they are all in the building package. Mrs. Murphy

asked if there was an existing plan that shows the entire site with the structures on the plan. Mr. Williams stated we have an existing plan of the whole site with the existing garage but I believe the building size is different on the plan. Mrs. Murphy stated the following: If you are going to retain the old building, then any approval by this Board would have to be contingent upon the applicant putting the old building on this map because this is going to be the map that the Planning Department is going to stamp. If pursuant to your life of mine you decide not to use the existing building, therefore the building would have to come down and don't have to make that adjustment. Obviously, we don't want you to show something that isn't going to exist in the future. Mr. Marotta stated that the old building is coming down. Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the site plan for R.J. Valente (Halfmoon Materials Group). Mr. Ruchlicki seconded. Motion carried.

07.013 OB Bove Storage Center, S. Main St. & Larkspur Ave – Commercial Site Plan

Mr. John Gay, of Northeast Consultants P.C., stated the following: I was before the Board earlier in the year for a conceptual commercial site plan and many things came out of that discussion which we have incorporated into our plans. The front of the buildings have been designed so that they will look more residential or more businesslike than just self-storage units and this is depicted on the map. We have added wrought iron fencing around the entire front of the property. We have fence in the other area with metal fencing. We added extensive landscaping on the property and the type of landscaping material that will soften this site. I think those were the major issues the Board had. We have added our stormwater management area and added our grading on the plans and our drainage courses and patterns. I think we have developed a plan that closely indicates what the Board articulated earlier in the year. Mr. Nadeau stated there is a fair amount of residential housing in the area and I think the Board should schedule a Public Informational meeting for this project in case anyone has issues before the applicant started the project. Mr. Watts asked if this site bordered Mechanicville. Mr. Gay stated it borders the city of Mechanicville but the project would be in the Halfmoon section. The VFW is located in Mechanicville and the active railroad would be behind the site along with some houses to the south. We think the plan we have does fit the character of the neighbor as closely as possible without having the area all residential. Mr. Watts stated they have done a good job with the Board's concerns. We will schedule a Public Informational meeting for our next meeting and will notify people in the area so they will have an opportunity to voice their concerns with the proposed project.

Mr. Nadeau made a motion to set a Public Informational Meeting for the July 23, 2007 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Ouimet seconded. Motion carried.

07.038 OB Sheldon Hills PDD-Phase 2, Route 146 & Upper Newtown Road - Major Subdivision/GEIS/PDD

Mr. Mike McNamara, of Environmental Design Partnership, LLP, stated the following: When we were last before the Board we discussed our intent to replace 16 of the single-family homes at the end of Sheldon Drive with 22 twin home units. This would result in 6 additional units in Phase 2 and we would make up for that in an equivalent reduction in Phase 3. Also, since our last meeting we put together Phase 2 plans and we have forwarded those to CHA and we received a letter from them confirming that they don't have any comments. We are before the Board to request a Public Hearing for this project as soon as possible.

Mr. Ruchlicki made a motion to set a Public Hearing for the July 23, 2007 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Nadeau seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Nadeau made a motion to adjourn the July 9, 2007 Planning Board Meeting at 7:52 pm.
Mr. Ruchlicki seconded. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
Milly Pascuzzi,
Planning Board Secretary