

**MEETING MINUTES
Town of Halfmoon Planning Board
August 10, 2015**

Those present at the August 10, 2015 Planning Board meeting were:

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

Planning Board Alternates: Robert Partlow
Margaret Sautter

Director of Planning: Richard Harris - absent
Planner: Paul Marlow

Town Attorney: Lyn Murphy
Deputy Town Attorney: Cathy Drobny

Town Board Liaison: John Wasielewski
Jeremy Connors

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

Vice Chairman Roberts made a motion to approve the July 27, 2015 minutes, seconded by Mr. Partlow. Mr. Ruchlicki abstained. Motion was carried.

Chairman Ouimet commented: There is a change on the Agenda tonight, Cardin Acres, Roger Lane/Chateau Drive/David Lane ó Amendment to Site Plan is being removed at the request of the Developers.

PUBLIC HEARING:

15.088 Robert Ballard, Thomas S. Ballard & Thomas G. Ballard, 21 Smith Road – Lot Line Adjustment

Chairman Ouimet commented: Would anyone like the notice read? No one chose to speak.

Mr. Robert Wilklow, VanGuilder Associates commented: I am here representing Mr. Tom Ballard for a Lot-Line Adjustment. Mr. Ballard owns a Parcel on Smith Road as well as on Vosburgh Road with his brother Robert. The parcel that has frontage on Smith Road has wetlands in the back that he can't access from the Smith Road Property so he would like to perform a lot line adjustment with

property on Vosburgh Road so he would be able to access the uplands. At this time, it is strictly just for the Lot Line Adjustment to be able to have access to the uplands.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Do you have a laser pointer with you tonight? Can you point the lot line adjustment for the public?

Mr. Wilklow commented: That will be the old lot line and that will be the new one. Where the old lot line is over to the wetlands will basically be useless land to Mr. Ballard because he wouldn't be able to access it through the Smith Road lot.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Thank you. Would anyone from the public wish to speak? Paul I understand that we received a letter from the public, an adjoining landowner?

Mr. Marlow commented: Yes we did receive one late this afternoon that will be entered into the record.

Chairman Ouimet commented: That was distributed to the Board at the pre-meeting?

Mr. Marlow commented: Correct.

Mrs. Murphy commented: Can you put it on the record who the letter was from.

Mr. Marlow commented: The letter received was from Mr. Brendon Lyons an adjacent parcel owner.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Please come up to the podium and state your name and address for the record.

Mr. Donald Baker commented: I am here with my wife Linda and we live at 141 Vosburgh Road which is adjacent to the paper driveway or street that probably is part of this lot line alignment change. We just want to point out where that area is. I am a former transportation professional and I worked in the safety area of my department in the Department of Transportation. I want to encourage the Board to seriously look at the transportation issues that are involved with that should this development proceed from here to actual development because I believe that you're going to find there are significant increases in traffic on Vosburgh Road since the original layout was proposed many years ago. The Town itself has put traffic lights at the end of Vosburgh clearly indicating that they have seen the impacts of the increase traffic. The road itself is going up this serious hill with I believe a serious line of sight problem which will create a serious safety issue. Both my property and the property on the other side on that will be impacted greatly. I would encourage the Board that should these plans further develop that they look at the traffic implications on that. Thank you.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Are there any comments from the Developer's side?

Mr. Wilklow commented: That would have to be addressed if the future development happens. At this point it is strictly for the lot line adjustment.

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

Mrs. Amanda House commented: I live at 20 Smith Road which is across from the lot on Smith Road obviously. I am concerned because once again this is a lot line adjustment and this has been on-going ever since the subdividing went on to that parcel. This is the second lot line adjustment and originally when this whole subdivision was created we were told no duplexes now there is a duplex across the street from me. It just seems like a plan was set forth before this Board that has consistently changed. I just, like I did with the last lot line adjustment just take into consideration and consider the ripple effect that each one of these little changes can create and take into consideration the fact that there is never an answer when you ask why. Why the lot line adjustment? What is the plan for the parcel that is being changed right now?

Mr. Wilklow commented: At this point there maybe future development but right now it's just so he can access the uplands that he can't access now.

Mrs. House commented: From Vosburgh as opposed to from Smith Road?

Mr. Wilklow commented: Correct.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Are you suggesting that there is future development plans for Lot A and Lot B?

Mr. Wilklow commented: Well no, there would be just future development for Lot A at this point.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Lot A. So the only access point on Lot A is that stub.

Mr. Wilklow commented: It would be a key hole, correct.

Mrs. House commented: Also, as far as I can tell Lot B which is the one with Smith Road frontage at the back of that lot there is still people residing there, is that correct? Because before the duplex was built there were some houses that Mr. Ballard referred to as shacks that he had people residing in.

Mr. Wilklow commented: I believe he has a business working back there but I am not sure.

Mrs. House commented: Judging by the traffic that goes constantly throughout the night I am not surprised. Is there a change in plans for that?

Mr. Wilklow commented: No there is no change in the plan that I know of for that, no.

Mrs. House commented: I think someone is living there I don't believe that it's just a business. It is the same car.

Mr. Wilklow commented: I can't make that distinction.

Mrs. House commented: Thank you.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Thank you very much. Anyone else from the public like to speak?

Mr. Joe Willet married to formally Amanda Haliday, Amanda Willet now of 149 Vosburgh Road commented: She could not make it to the meeting. I was just curious because it's a lot line adjustment I have a lot of the same questions as Mrs. House. I assume that you can't access this and you want to change all of this and come right in between the Baker and the Haliday property.

Mr. Wilklow commented: Correct. He already owns the strip that is on Vosburgh Road, this parcel here. So he just wants to annex a parcel that he cannot get to from Smith Road.

Mr. Willet commented: Is this the only area that is considered wetland right now because I live right under these lines and that is all cat nine tails and running water 70% of the year which comes right down through where this access would go. Beyond the whole traffic point these are all great points but this is a blind road area. I am on top of the hill and it is a dangerous spot to pull out everyday I have to cut back just to see you go by to get out of there. My concern is that beyond the traffic in the road what is going to happen with all this water when they build there is that just going to come right over and flood our lands? I don't see that being represented as wetlands here and it's wet right now you couldn't walk back there with a pair of shoes.

Mr. Wilklow commented: If Mr. Ballard wants to develop that area we would have to look at that in a more comprehensive form and have the wetlands addressed further along with road concerns and traffic patterns. It would all have to be taken into consideration at that time. At this point it's just merely to add land.

Mr. Willet commented: Is this the original lot line?

Mr. Wilklow commented: That is correct.

Mr. Willet commented: Is this the proposed?

Mr. Wilklow commented: Yes, correct.

Mr. Willet commented: The proposed is just to turn this all into one lot?

Mr. Wilklow commented: yes.

Mr. Willet commented: Now you are saying that in this proposal the building would only be here and it would be subject to be built where he could access it.

Mr. Wilklow commented: It would be but it would have to come back in front of the Planning Board for subdivision approval or anything further that he would want to do. At this point by granting the lot line adjustment he technically could draw one building permit. If he wants to do any other development he would have to come back in front of this Planning Board for subdivision approval.

Mr. Willet commented: Thank you.

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

Brendan Lyons, 139 Vosburgh Road commented: I have a question about this map it shows wetland delineated here but there are additional wetlands that aren't shown that straddle the area of the key hole lot as it exists? They may not be shown on here but aren't there additional wetlands that are located where the road strip is and also through this area and then along this tree line?

Mr. Wilklow commented: There very well maybe. We are just showing this to show the problematic portion of Lot B and not being able to access the land in the back.

Mr. Lyons commented: The only thing I didn't understand on this map is that you're saying he has road frontage here and these two are part of the same lot right?

Mr. Wilklow commented: Correct, this is all Smith Road lots and only this little flag lot hits Vosburgh Road right now. So what he is proposing is to annex this portion right here to the flag lot.

Mr. Lyons commented: I understand but your saying that he can't access this portion of the property from this which is what I don't understand.

Mr. Wilklow commented: Correct, he would have wetland disturbance because its wetlands all the way through here from property line to property line so he wouldn't have access to this.

Mr. Lyons commented: From there up is that what we are saying?

Mr. Wilklow commented: Correct, wetlands are right in this area here.

Mr. Lyons commented: Just to make clear the additional wetlands here just aren't delineated at this time but they are there.

Mr. Wilklow commented: Correct.

Mr. Lyons commented: Do you know if he has plans now for a cul-de-sac? He did mention it to us earlier this spring about wanting to build a cul-de-sac?

Mr. Wilklow commented: I am not 100% sure. I know he said there is a possible future development but as far as what it is I don't know.

Mr. Lyons commented: Thank you.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Thank you. Would anyone else from the public wish to speak? Are there any questions from the Board?

Mr. Higgins commented: John, I had a question at the previous meeting when we scheduled the public hearing Duane was here and I asked him specifically about the function of those buildings in the back that were previously being used by a tree company. When we approved the 3-lot subdivision we were told they were going to be moving out of there and they weren't going to use the driveway as access to

the buildings. Now they are still using the driveway next to the son's duplex as access in and out of there which we were told they were not going to be doing.

Mr. Wilklow commented: Duane did talk to Tom Ballard about that. He says that he plans on putting a separate driveway in for the tree planting business.

Mr. Higgins commented: That was part of the approval I don't know exactly how the C.O.s were listed but as part of the approval he is not suppose to use the driveway as access to the building. That was #1, and #2 you are stating that the drawing that we have in front of us tonight is not complete as far as wetland delineation on Lot A is that correct?

Mr. Wilklow commented: That I am not 100% sure. I don't want to say it is until our wetland guy does mapping for the portion in the back.

Mr. Higgins commented: Well I guess whether or not this lot line adjustment gets approved you might want to mention to Mr. Ballard that if there is wetland concerns on the access off of Vosburgh Road he shouldn't start clearing or putting any kind of temporary driveway or road in there until the wetlands are all delineated.

Mr. Wilklow commented: Ok.

Mr. Higgins commented: So that he is made to understand that just because he does in fact get a lot line adjustment he still has to be concerned about where the wetland delineation is located in accessing the property.

Mr. Wilklow commented: Correct.

Mr. Higgins commented: Thank you John.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Are there any other questions?

Mrs. Sautter commented: We received a lot of information pretty late during the pre-meeting specifically from one letter but I think due to the fact there is no wetland delineation. I did look at this area on the GIS today and I believe that the people that spoke tonight are correct that there are wetlands. I know that there are wetlands specifically in that area and I believe there is a fresh pond but that might be located in the back of the lot. I know there are 3-acres but in the front there is some concern and I would like to see that always shown on every map regardless wetlands is always an important point. Thank you.

Mr. Wilklow commented: Ok.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Are there any other questions? I think based upon the volume of information that we received tonight and in light of the fact that a 3-page letter was submitted. I know Mr. Lyons spoke tonight at the public hearing but he also submitted a 3-letter in support of his position. I think a lot of questions were raised to the Board and I think it would be unfair to call for a vote tonight from the Board. I think what we will do is adjourn the public hearing, put this back on for our next

meeting, and in the interim have some of the issues that were raised tonight explored. As the developer's representative you are free to submit additional information to the Board. The public hearing is not closed it will remain open we will reconvene at our next meeting. Are there any other comments, final comments? So that is what we will do. Thank you very much.

Mr. Wilklow commented: Thank you we appreciate it.

Chairman Ouimet commented: I appreciate that everyone from the public who came out to speak tonight.

(Letter attached to minutes)

August 10, 2015

Town of Halfmoon Planning Board
2 Halfmoon Town Plaza
Halfmoon, New York 12065

Re: Public hearing for (15.088) Ballard subdivision proposal – Smith/Vosburgh Roads

To Whom It May Concern:

We are writing this letter to respectfully outline concerns about the ongoing subdivision(s) of lands at Smith and Vosburgh roads owned and developed by Thomas Ballard, et al.

- In March 2008, the town Planning Board firmly rejected the Ballard family's proposed major subdivision for land encompassing much of the aforementioned parcels.
- Among other issues, the board in 2008 cited "obvious" wetlands-disturbance issues on a "very difficult piece of property (to develop)." The board also noted the prior plan's conflicts with the Northern Halfmoon GEIS; unsafe/unsightly driveway cuts on Smith Road; the "severe intrusion" of a planned cul-de-sac off Vosburgh Road (please see below, as this is a factor in the current request); an inability to build the cul-de-sac without destroying wetlands; and a desire by the Town to preserve "quality green-space along the road frontage." (Planning Board minutes March 24, 2008.)
- Upon information and belief, members of the Planning Board and planning staff acknowledged during a pre-meeting earlier this year that the developers of these parcels have engaged in a "piece-meal" plan to build a subdivision resembling their original project that was rejected in 2008 – essentially developing individual parcels to arguably undercut the town planning process and subvert the provisions of the Northern Halfmoon GEIS.
- This piece-meal approach has lowered neighboring property values and sharply increased surface-water flows to neighboring properties, causing severe erosion and property damage.
- The request before the panel tonight is more than a "lot line adjustment."
- According to statements made earlier this year by Mr. Thomas Ballard, the proposed subdivision under consideration at today's hearing is intended to facilitate his plan to build an 8-unit cul-de-sac off Vosburgh Road. That proposal would be facilitated by the subdivision application before the board

tonight. The long-term plan is similar to the cul-de-sac proposal rejected in 2008. This parcel cannot support such an "intrusive" cul-de-sac plan - as the board characterized the cul-de-sac proposal in its prior rejection.

- By allowing Mr. Ballard to engage in "piece-meal" development, the Town may have unwittingly facilitated Mr. Ballard's apparent plan(s) to avoid needed scrutiny of his projects. This piece-meal approach is also allowing Mr. Ballard to collectively disturb multi-acres of land without the required storm-water and soil-erosion reviews, approvals and fees.
- The ongoing subdivision plans have been facilitated and submitted to the Town by a licensed surveyor who is not an engineer. This approach also has allowed each subdivision/lot line approval to skirt more thorough engineering, archeological, planning, storm-water, soil-erosion, wetlands and environmental reviews.
- An independent delineation of the federal wetlands, and adjacent state wetlands off Vosburgh Road, has not been conducted in more than five years. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers should be consulted and sign off on any update.
- As result of the ongoing piece-meal development of the Smith/Vosburgh road parcels, the soil erosion and storm-water runoff on adjacent properties have significantly increased - leading at least one property owner to spend thousands of dollars to repair a damaged foundation. The damage is being exacerbated by the additional soil disturbances that are ongoing.
- The keyhole easement that intersects Vosburgh Road is not suitable for a road because it may not meet (or would barely meet) the minimum frontage (according to an independent review by a licensed engineer); there is a dangerous blind-spot in that spot along a hill on Vosburgh Road; and the road would be constructed too close to neighboring properties - lowering the values of those residences and diminishing the quality of life for existing, long-term property owners and taxpayers.
- The Planning Board has discretion to deny projects that are not within the scope of the Northern Halfmoon GEIS. The board also should weigh whether the project is in the best interest of the community and existing residents, or would adversely affect those neighboring property owners.
- We respect that Mr. Ballard has an interest in developing his property(ies), but request that the Town insure that this be done in a more responsible way that does not saturate this area with a new road, driveways and housing units. This Planning Board has previously acknowledged that these parcels are problematic and not suitable for such intrusive construction. The issues at stake include additional soil erosion and flooding of neighboring properties, potential groundwater contamination for active wells, and a severe reduction in the quality-of-life and diminished property values for those neighboring properties.

Thank you in advance for taking these concerns under consideration in your review of this latest request.

Respectfully submitted,

Christina and Brendan Lyons
139 Vosburgh Road
Halfmoon, NY 12118

OLD BUSINESS:**15.095 Access Auto Sales, 1516 Crescent Vischer Ferry Road – Change of Tenant/Use**

Mr. Joe Lombardi, Owner of Access Auto Sales commented: I am looking for a Change of Tenant and Use at 1516 property. I was here 3-weeks ago at the previous meeting and some of the Board Members came out and visited the property and made some adjustments to the orientation of the parking and to delete a few spaces making it friendly and easier to get in and out of the area better. I submitted some paperwork to Paul and I think he handed it out to you to show the re-orientation of the spaces. I guess that was the big concern. We deleted 3 spaces for the U-Haul and 2 spaces for the display lot that brought it down to 4 U-Haul spaces, 3 display spaces and 2 employee parking spaces. I don't have any employees and the main use of the property is my whole sale business which I need a display area for. I do have retail and whole sale license. Once again, I am not going to be retailing cars it is mainly for my whole sale business.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Basically you are affiliated with Access Auto as well?

Mr. Lombardi commented: I am Access Auto.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Margaret I know you were part of the committee that went for the site visit and took a look at the actual layout of the parking spaces. Would you care to give us a brief report on what the committee found?

Mrs. Sautter commented: The three of us met as he stated and we took a look at the existing property it was very difficult, I think last time the site plan was used was maybe not what we thought it was or there was just some confusion. It was very helpful to go and see exactly where things are going to be parked because I believe it did say there was a grass area and you were saying that it was gravel so we all decided that it is indeed gravel. That is a good place for you to park the U-Haul and I believe as a group that we decided that 4 U-Haul parking spaces as you stated would be sufficient. I am not sure that included trailers correct?

Mr. Lombardi commented: Yes.

Mrs. Sautter commented: So 4 U-Haul equipment I am going to state.

Mr. Lombardi commented: That would be fine.

Mrs. Sautter commented: In display parking area do the vehicles have to have dealer plates did we decide that? Should they have them? You were using your vehicle as a dealer as well?

Mr. Lombardi commented: As a display vehicle? If my vehicle was there it would be parked as a display vehicle.

Mrs. Sautter commented: Ok, yes. I believe that we said there were three display spaces. I didn't see any problem with it I thought it was perfect for what it is. However, do you have control over how many U-Hauls get dropped off or picked up each day?

Mr. Lombardi commented: I can delete them or add them.

Mrs. Sautter commented: Ok. There was some concern during the pre-meeting that other U-Haul members say that they sometimes come and bring in 30 units and sometimes there will be 10 units.

Mr. Lombardi commented: I wish they could give me 30 units and if you could approve 30 but they won't. You have to be familiar with the system that they have and you can delete vehicles and add vehicles and they will call you before they drop anything off. You may get an e-mail or you will get notification on the U-Haul system and you can deny it or add it. I could go up to Treads at Exit 10. I know there is a bit of a mishap at Treads because there are a lot of U-Hauls everywhere there. You can push them to Cohoes you can push them anywhere. If it's 4 that we get then it's 4 that we keep.

Mrs. Sautter commented: That was our concern and we just wanted you to be aware that if you were going to agree to 4 you can't have more than 4. If Code Enforcement saw more than that, we wanted you to have control over that and I am glad that you do, they would site you for being over what your approval states.

Mr. Lombardi commented: We do have control of it.

Mrs. Sautter commented: Ok, thank you.

Mr. Higgins commented: If you have more than that and Code Enforcement sites you and they would warn you but if it continues that would site you and then you are liable for the fine. We just want to make sure that you understand that before we approve it.

Mr. Lombardi commented: I understand.

Mr. Higgins commented: The other thing that we talked about was Morris Lane, it is a Town Road you can't utilize that for parking in front of your shop at any time.

Chairman Ouimet commented: The only other thing that I have is on one of the drawings that you submitted while it shows 4 spaces for the display parking there is already a written notation there that says 5 holding.

Mr. Lombardi commented: I wasn't sure what 5 holding meant whoever the Engineer was then.

Chairman Ouimet commented: I think there were originally 5 spaces set aside for that area.

Mr. Lombardi commented: That could be from an old plan there are only 3 where it says 5 holding. Is that what you are questioning? That is the display parking and that was when we re-orientated this old drawing. The original drawing has 5 spaces there but because you came out to the site we said you

would re-orient these vehicles. We will give you basically the same amount of spaces if you're going to put 4 here and 3 here and 2 employee spaces because I have 7 spaces in total.

Chairman Ouimet commented: So assuming your request is approved would you be willing to modify that language so it would read 3 holdings or completely strike it out and put your initials there?

Mr. Lombardi commented: Absolutely.

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

Mr. Lombardi commented: Just 3 holding for that particular space, right?

Chairman Ouimet commented: Yes. There is a conflict of what you show and what you say and we don't need any future conflicts and people here tonight know what we talked about.

Mr. Lombardi commented: I would happy to re-submit that with my initials on it.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Thank you.

Vice Chairman Roberts commented: When we were out at the site visit I asked you about a sign and if want a sign you have to come back into the Board.

Mr. Lombardi commented: Correct.

Vice Chairman Roberts made a motion to approve this application on the condition that the site plan be corrected, seconded by Mr. Ruchlicki. Motion was carried.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Change of Use and Tenant approved. Thank you.

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

Mr. Jason Dell, I am an Engineer with Lansing Engineering commented: I am here on behalf of the applicant the Harbor Freight Project. We were here 2 weeks ago when the Board approved this project and we are back before you tonight to request a minor revision to that plan. On the approved plan where the entrance was approved there is a power pole currently. In order to not have to move that power pole and deal with National Grid the applicant would like to shift the entrance approximately 170 south on Route 9 and enter the site there. It is this area right here. Formally the entrance came in here we are just shifting it 170 south. What it will do to the site plan is 5 parking stalls will be eliminated per the original approved plan. We were required by Code to have 173 parking spaces. The approved plan called for 196 parking stalls so removing the 5 spaces still leaves us well in excess of what is required by the Code we would have 191 parking spaces. That is our request this evening.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Jason, what is the status of the lot consolidation?

Mr. Dell commented: It's in process and I was on vacation last week so I don't know exactly where that is but it is in process.

Chairman Ouimet commented: It is my understanding that you need complete consolidation in order for this plan to move forward.

Mr. Dell commented: That is correct.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Any questions from the Board?

Mr. Higgins commented: Are they 10ø x 20ø parking spaces? All of them?

Mr. Dell commented: Yes. Yes.

Mr. Higgins commented: Thank you.

Vice Chairman Roberts commented: Jason please satisfy my curiosity here we are among friends here I am not trying to embarrass you at all. This is the second meeting in a row (not you) but the second meeting in a row where we had someone come back and make changes because of the utility pole. How do you not find that when you are doing the plans?

Mr. Dell commented: It has been on the plans from day one but because of time constraints and dealing with National Grid right now and the fact that they are backed up by months and months. It is significant and substantial time frames that we would be talking about in order to just shift that pole a little bit.

Vice Chairman Roberts commented: How do you map it, the pole is there. Why would you, why would anyone do a plan with a driveway right there? I am just curious.

Mr. Dell commented: Why we did it was to not mess with it we had a straight end shot it was a 90 degree angle we don't have a jog in the road we were maximizing parking stalls so there was a method to the madness to come in straight off of Route 9 and not have the jog. When you have a jogs like that with curbing it is tougher to plow. It is never an ideal situation to have that sort of thing it is traffic calming. In essence if you look at the long term maintenance it is a pain in the butt especially when it comes to plowing there.

Chairman Ouimet commented: So there is only going to be one curb cut for the Sandwich Shop plus the proposed offices in the back? Or is there two?

Mr. Dell commented: There is one curb cut we have an emergency entrance that we had worked on with the Emergency Services that we provided over here.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Alright. Do you need approval from DOT to move the driveway?

Mr. Dell commented: The DOT curb-cut will get approved by DOT, yes.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Are there any other questions? Is there a motion?

Mr. Higgins made a motion to approve the revised drawing with the single curb cut located 17' south for Harbor Freight, seconded by Vice Chairman Roberts. Motion was carried.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Application is approved. You do understand that the Site Plan will not be signed until such time as the consolidation is finalized.

Mr. Dell commented: I understand that.

Chairman Ouimet commented: Thank you.

Mr. Dell commented: Thank you.

Mr. Ruchlicki made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Higgins. Motion was carried.

Meeting was adjourned
Respectfully submitted by Denise Mikol, Secretary
Town of Halfmoon Planning Board