Ron Zimmerman Planning Board Chair
Jerry Bouchard Planning Board Member
John Arnold Planning Board Member
Reed Antis Planning Board Member
Erik Bergman Planning Board Member
Peter Jensen Planning Board Member
Mike Shaver Planning Board Member

Also present: Jim Martin, Zoning Administrator; Ann Purdue, Esq., Alternate Planning Board Member Tricia Andrews, Recording Secretary

Not present: Meredithe Mathias, Alternate Planning Board Member

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 pm by Ron Zimmerman, Chair. The Board reviewed the minutes of the August 19, 2019 meeting. On Page 2205 it should state, "Mr Zimmerman asked whether ...trucks come and out to do off-site shredding (not off-sire). Same page further down "Mr. Martin stated that they 'are' not "area." Motion to approve the minutes as amended was made by Mr. Antis and seconded by Mr. Shaver. Motion carries, all in favor with no roll call but Mr. Arnold abstaining.

## Doyle/Bartlett Reservoir Road Amended Site Plan

Donald Pidgeon representing the applicant explained that Mr. Bartlett didn't like where the building would be situated when Mr. Pidgeon went to stake it out. He asked the Zoning Board for a Variance because he didn't like where it was in relationship to the house. He got a Variance for ten feet from the eave, which are three inch eaves. Mr. Pidgeon moved it back. He staked it out at the new location, and now the plan has to be amended. The staking was a condition of ZBA approval to make sure the setback was correct by surveyor.

Mr. Martin stated that is the only change on the plan as far as he knows.

Mr. Arnold asked for clarification as to why it wasn't good where it was and Mr. Pidgeon stated that Mr. Bartlett thought he needed a better sight line to the back yard, and he didn't think he could drive back there easily. Mr. Arnold expressed he didn't like the decision, but it was already done.

Mr. Pidgeon added that the site looks nice.

Mr. Arnold brought up that all the vegetation was removed, when it was intended to be left for screening. Mr. Pidgeon said that they do plan to do screening trees, not shrubberies.

Mr. Martin said that Assemblywoman Woerner's office had called him today about the frequency and number of hearing on this matter, which he forwarded to the Supervisor with an update on what has gone on there up to now. There is confusion about this. It is up to the Board whether they need to have a public hearing on it. Last time, they did not. They can ask for a change on the plan if it affects health, safety and welfare.

Mr. Pidgeon stated that the Zoning Board meeting was not controversial.

Mr. Arnold stated it is not a change of use, it is a change of position on one building.

It is the same size of building, parking is the same, building is just closer to the front line.

Mr. Antis asked if there should be a berm for the size of the road. Mr. Arnold stated there was never a berm, just vegetation. Mr. Pidgeon said that they will do the trees as soon as they get everything settled.

There was a row of conifers for screening on the east property line, not on the south which is the road.

Mr. Pidgeon stated that it is a business, and the owner wanted to be visible. Mr. Antis argued that it can be seen from the road, and Mr. Pidgeon didn't agree.

Mr. Arnold asked and there is no other change to lighting, drywells, etc. It is graded.

Mr. Martin advised the Board that there have been complaints about the topsoil he removed and has stockpiled in the yard to put back.

Mr. Arnold motioned to waive the public hearing in light of the changes being minimal. Mr. Antis seconded. Roll call vote resulted as follows: Mr. Bouchard, Yes; Mr. Antis, Yes; Mr. Arnold, Yes; Mr. Bergman, Yes; Mr. Shaver, Yes; Mr. Jensen, Yes; Chairman Zimmerman, Yes.

Mr. Arnold asked whether it is acceptable to say that he disagrees with the Zoning Board's decision and doesn't like this building so close to the road.

Mr. Martin stated that he should couch his objections in terms of the criteria that the Board has to follow. He also pointed out that the ZBA gave only half the Variance requested.

Mr. Arnold wanted to go on the record that he didn't like this.

Mr. Martin stated he was eager to get to the point where this Site Plan can be enforced, which is after it is completed and a Certificate of Occupancy is requested.

Chairman Zimmerman wanted to see what it looked like and Mr. Pidgeon didn't know for sure what the garage would look like, but it is one story, big enough for trucks.

Mr. Martin reminded the Board that this building is in lieu of any outside storage.

Mr. Arnold asked why there wasn't a dumpster site on the plan, since it is a Commercial site.

Mr. Bergman thought he remembered discussion that he won't do work on site, this is a showroom so it won't generate a lot of debris.

 $\operatorname{Mr.}$  Bouchard motioned to approve amended Site Plan August 10, 2019; second by  $\operatorname{Mr.}$  Bergman.

Roll call vote resulted as follows: Mr. Bouchard, Yes; Mr. Antis, Yes; Mr. Arnold, Yes; Mr. Bergman, Yes; Mr. Shaver, Yes; Mr. Jensen, Yes; Chairman Zimmerman, Yes.

Craig McCarty of 201 Reservoir Road spoke and stated that Mr. Pidgeon had misrepresented things. Neighbors opposed to the Variance did go to the Zoning Board and were not happy. It was not without controversy. There are junk cars. There is dirt, there are tall weeds. Things described as temporary have been there 8 months. When can residents get some relief? There is a rusted out camper that has been there three years, a truck, 18 wheeler, truck from a linen circus. Why can't they get it looking halfway decent? If they care about the neighborhood, why haven't they taken care of the location?

Mr. Arnold stated that on-site lighting and a sign were discussed.

Mr. McCarty thought the public should have seen a copy of the map rather than getting a verbal overview. A parking lot was not discussed at original meetings. There is a large history of revisions that people right next door didn't know were being made.

Mr. Arnold stated that concerns at Zoning do not surprise him, but this Board doesn't have the right to overturn their decisions. There have been multiple revisions. But Mr. Arnold is eager to see this done, and that the revisions are always ones that make the site better than it was. This is the first time he has seen a revision he didn't like. Mr. Arnold asked Mr. Pidgeon to pass along the message that he doesn't want to see any other revisions. Chairman Zimmerman stated that none of the junk is on the drawing and those are compliance issues that will be enforced when it is possible to do so.

Mr. McCarty stated that it was never in compliance even though Mr. Martin said it was.

Mr. Martin stated it is a construction site, he can't help that. The sooner it is ready for a C.O., the sooner he will have the means for enforcement. If he brings it to a judge, they will say wait for the construction to be done.

Mr. McCarty stated that he has to live next to it.

Mr. Martin pointed out that Mr. McCarty lives next to a commercial property and that is what happens, and he is doing his best.

Chairman Zimmerman asked whether the Board wanted to add time limits on the completion.

Mr. Martin agreed that would be appropriate.

Chairman Zimmerman stated that considering how prolonged this project has been, this would be appropriate.

Mr. Martin asked Mr. Pidgeon for a reasonable opinion on what the applicant could do. Mr. Pidgeon thought a couple of months, or the first of the year.

Mr. Arnold asked and the building is there. It is pre-fab and will be on a slab floor. Mr. Arnold thought that could be done in two weeks. Mr. Pidgeon was concerned about the weather.

Mr. Arnold stated that a lot has been done to mitigate the commercial/residential conflict. It has been worked on. The impatience for site cleanup is understandable. It looks worse from Route 9 as far as Mr. Arnold is concerned. Steel structures are really quick to put together.

Bruce Lant, of 199Reservoir Road stated he has concerns about the history of compliance in this property. There is a pile of stumps now. Allow one thing, you get another. Compliance is needed. Mr. Pidgeon agreed.

Mr. Arnold motioned for an amendment stating that all work has to be done to C.O. standard in 60 days from signature. Mr. Bouchard seconded. Roll call vote resulted as follows: Mr. Bouchard, Yes; Mr. Antis, Yes; Mr. Arnold, Yes; Mr. Bergman, Yes; Mr. Shaver, Yes; Mr. Jensen, Yes; Chairman Zimmerman, Yes. Motion that the Chair and one other member sign the final mylars was made by Mr. Arnold and seconded by Mr. Bergman. All in favor motion carries no roll call.

## Robbin Ogden Giachino Fort Edward Road Sketch Plan

Mrs. Giachino 143 Fort Edward Road, Fort Edward, explained that she wants to buy this lot. It is a family subdivision, but this has already been done about two years ago so it can't be handled administratively. The section that appears like an easement is to Fort Edward. Her aunt owns it.

Mr. Arnold asked for the connection to the public highway and Mr. Martin stated that it is there, and pointed it out. That is not an easement it is real property. There is another easement behind that, which is what the label is for. Mr. Martin stated he would check to make sure it was properly recorded. Mr. Bouchard asked about the lands of Scott and Patti Health. Their access doesn't look like 40 ft. Mrs. Giachino stated that Bill Rourke had come and marked it all and was not taking away from the Heaths. This doesn't affect the Heath property. Some time was spent trying to clarify the map. Her aunt just gave her a portion and the tax map is being revised, and that is why it doesn't look like she has 40 ft. Chairman Zimmerman stated that the tax map and this map do not agree.

Mr. Giachino stated that he didn't like the map either.

Mr. Martin asked the applicant to come in tomorrow and he would help clean up the map. The Board asked that it clearly show the boundary adjustment and the required road frontage, and the most recent other subdivision.

Gardner Congdon North Branch Brook Selfridge Road Sketch Plan Review

Mr. Antis disclosed a friendly relationship with Mr. Congdon and Mr. Bouchard disclosed that he is related to Mr. Congdon, but has no stake in this property and can judge the proposal on its merits. Mr. Martin indicated this needs to be reviewed by Zoning for a Variance for not having adequate frontage on a Town road, but he allowed it to come to Planning tonight before that Variance is heard, because of time constraints for the applicant. The plan is to have frontage on Lots 2 & 3, and get the Variances for Lots 1, 4,5. If that is denied, this will all change.

Matthew Webster of Van Dusen & Steves Land Surveyors presented. The map shows topography, superimposed wetlands with setbacks from Saratoga County GIS to show that there is enough buildable area. They are DEC Wetlands. Lot 2 access as proposed is off of Hatchery Road with frontage on Selfridge Road. There is a brook along Selfridge that makes access difficult.

Mr. Martin explained that if the Variance is approved solid easements will have to be recorded in the deeds to ensure access, if it is approved.

Mr. Bouchard asked for the width of the driveway and it is 63.78ft, and length to the lot line for #3 is not shown Mr. Webster said he would add it.

Mr. Antis asked if Lot 2 starts where the L6 is and Mr. Webster said that is where the shared driveway ends. There are six lots sharing the driveway. The easement to the existing house is already recorded. The two existing lots on Hatchery Road are a separate property, not subdivided from this, from two or three years ago. Mr. Antis wanted to make sure they weren't subdivided off this parcel.

Mr. Bouchard asked Mr. Congdon whether the whole thing, existing lots was once one. Mr. Congdon stated that the big one he has owned since 1961, and the two existing lots he bought in 1981, and he has always paid taxes separately on them. The right of way was necessary for John Hogan to access this land. Mr. Martin stated that Mr. Congdon had recently amended the boundaries on Hatchery to provide the access to the back, and the one on the left was under 5 acres, so it was made larger with that little notch. That wasn't a subdivision, it was a boundary line adjustment. The two were already divided. He was just providing frontage to the big back lot at that time. He formalized the easement then.

Whoever owns the Hogan lot will always have deeded access to Hatchery Road.

Mr. Antis asked who would be responsible for the driveway, and Mr. Martin said they would set up the same shared maintenance agreement they always do.

Mr. Congdon stated that he was correcting a problem, because the road didn't go where it was surveyed to go, and that's why he made the adjustment.

Mr. Congdon stated that DEC had flagged it for wetlands, and that there is a problem with the wetlands map. He stated that Leeann (Town Clerk) has a memo from the DEC relative to the mess. It was supposed to be corrected 15 years ago and 3 years ago a new map was adopted that no one knew about. The Board will see this come up more and more. Mr. Arnold said that they will follow the DEC map or have someone go walk it. Mr. Congdon stated that the Army Corps is not consulted anymore and there is no land left in Moreau.

Mr. Congdon stated he could put 40 ft flagpoles out for every lot, but he wants to be good to the environment and not cut across wetlands. He was told by DEC that he could get permits if he wanted to cross them, but he doesn't want to.

Mr. Jensen asked who owns the exiting lots, and Mr. Congdon owns the one on the right as you drive in. Mr. Arnold pointed out that the 40 ft frontage has to be land that can be used for ingress and egress, even if it isn't used.

Mr. Condgon said that the Board had to decide whether they'd like three driveways, or a private road. Mr. Arnold said there could also be a public road. He didn't think the Town Code allowed a private road. Shared driveway makes it sound like you have no frontage. 1,350 ft of driveway was calculated by the Board members. Chairman Jensen stated that they have to consider access for emergency services. Mrs. Congdon presented a letter from Fire stating that they have already looked and have room on the site. Mr. Congdon argued that flaglots hurt the wetlands.

Mr. Arnold stated that to draw a flaglot and stay within the code 40 ft on Selfridge, doesn't mean you have to use it. It's just a line on the Site Plan. Mr. Congdon argued that they would still need a driveway. Mr. Arnold agreed. He would not like to see a public road here, but he is uncomfortable with not having road frontage.

Mark Stewart, 32 Grey Fox Drive asked would the Board rather they show frontage on flagpoles, but not use it and still have a private road to get to lot 3 & 4. He meant shared driveway.

Mr. Arnold said that it is one item of concern. They do not like to create landlocked lots, even with rights of way, deeded access etc. Some of those are pre-existing, but this would create one. Two of the lots have frontage or can have frontage- 2 & 3. They might be able to get 50 ft from someone to add access there.

Mr. Congdon brought up similar subdivisions and Mr. Arnold explained how those were different. At 1350ft, a road would have to be a divided boulevard.

Mr. Congdon was opposed to that and Mr. Arnold stated they were trying to avoid it.

Mr. Congdon stated that he was trying to create small farms in keeping with right to farm law and Mr. Arnold stated that these were not farms.

Mr. Arnold suggested flagging 1 out across 2, and 3 the same way, but that Lot 4 was a problem. Mr. Arnold stated that he would like to see even 6 lots. Mr. Stewart said he would tree farm it.

Mr. Congdon said he plans to crate farms that people can afford who want to live in the country and have animals.

Mr. Bergman asked if they should evaluate based on the Variance that was being applied for. Because the question of flag lots becomes moot if that is awarded. Mr. Martin pointed out that the ZBA will look for alternatives before they grant the Variance. He thinks that this Board doesn't gain anything examining all that, creating circuitous routes. Mr. Bergman thought the Board should look at it as if it has the Variance, and Mr. Martin reminded him that they might not get that. The applicant asked the Board to do Sketch Plan and get underway.

Chairman Zimmerman stated it's challenging to do anything not knowing how the ZBA will rule. They understand what is intended. It is taking reasonable shape. They can't really move forward with it as presented. Either relief or modifications are needed. They could discuss things like emergency vehicle access. South Glens Falls Fire sent a letter than addressed lot 5 but not the entire plan or the changes that might be proposed.

Mr. Arnold suggested that using Selfridge Road for access would eliminate the problem. Mr. Stewart made a statement about getting Fire to amend the letter, and Mr. Martin stated it is #2 that is the problem, 2250 feet in, would they feel comfortable servicing a fire there?

Mr. Stewart stated that he was planning to buy more than one lot, and would it help if they were together. Mr. Martin said that it would.

Mr. Arnold continued to advocate for crossing the wetland and Mr. Martin said it is a value judgment whether they should cross that.

Mr. Stewart asked about the timing of the meetings and Mr. Martin stated again that combining Lots 2 & 3 was going to help a lot. Mr. Arnold stated again that he wants to see road frontage on a public road that can be used for ingress. If 2 & 3 were combined, one could be a flag lot.

Mr. Martin stated that this conversation would be the same at Zoning. Then they will just need a Variance for one lot.

Mr. Webster asked and having frontage not used for the driveway doesn't stop a builder from getting a permit.

Mr. Martin reminded him that easements and deed language and maintenance agreements will be required to protect everyone.

Mr. Bouchard stated that shared driveways have engineering requirements that guarantee it can handle the weight of emergency vehicle, such as depth of gravel.

Mr. Antis asked whether the 'lands to be merged with John Hogan' has already happened. Mr. Martin said it had. Mr. Martin explained again that there were three lots- two on Hatchery Road and the big one in the back. The big one gave some land to Hogan in exchange for an adjustment to make access, while keeping 5 acres. Mr. Webster said he would check to make sure that was done, and take that off if necessary. He remembered some sort of delay. It might not have been filed.

Mr. Antis asked whether there were building permits. There are not.

The shared access to Hogan was created ten years ago. How can an engineer know if it was done right? Mr. Martin said they would bore a section. That was all done to clean up the lines and get a proper easement, it was corrective. Mr. Martin approved all the boundary line adjustments.

The Congdons asked for approval pending the Zoning Board's decision.

Mr. Arnold stated that he could find 5 flag poles, so he doesn't think they should go ahead with anything not knowing what the Zoning Board is going to do.

This Board will do SEQR on this as an unlisted action.

Chairman Zimmerman said that as a 5 lot subdivision it might trigger Dept of Health involvement. Mr. Martin said that if it's not a Type 1, they don't have to notify. So they would notify DEC. Mr. Stewart stated DEC had walked the sites closest to the old hatchery, and approved their sites. Their letter has different lot numbers on it, but it was done.

Mr. Martin suggested the Board itemize any preliminary concerns, they do not have to approve a Sketch. Mr. Bergman said that assuming it passed as presented, his only concern would be design of the road

including passing space/turnarounds. Utility easements, etc will come into play, and the driveway has to be a minimum of 20 feet wide with 13 ft clearance. Mr. Bouchard stated on the Sketch it is currently 50 ft wide. That has to go to within 300 ft of the residences.

Mr. Congdon thought they were putting the cart before the horse, and the ZBA will want to know what they said as much as they want to know what the ZBA says. Mr. Arnold offered to send the ZBA these minutes.

Chairman Zimmerman said that their next steps will be to declare Lead Agency and move to preliminary review. Mr. Congdon told him to make recommendations so he could do them and go to Zoning. Chairman Zimmerman asked the Board what changes they would like to see.

Mr. Arnold suggested that Lot Four combine with the 50 on Hatchery Road, two and three combined together, and to make a deal with someone for lot 5 to give 50 and get 50, but Mr. Congdon pointed out that that person plans to build on the edge.

Lot 5 has an error on the survey. 150 ft width is required to build, it is 164 at the road. You could run two flagpoles off Hatchery Road. Chairman Zimmerman explained again that some lots recently done show 40 ft access points that are never touched. There is no expectation that they be used. This is done to help developers.

Mr. Bouchard explained that the Board can't fix a lot of the complaints Mr. Congdon has about the Codes and surveyor complaints, but the Zoning Board will help where it can. Without a Variance, this Board can't give him the private road, they don't have authority. They have to uphold Town Law.

Mr. Congdon wanted approval made subject to the ZBA action.

Mr. Bouchard said that the Board's feeling seems to be generally positive, but that it is just a Sketch and it isn't ready to be approved.

Mr. Martin asked for a resolution to the ZBA to let them know that the Planning Board agrees with the intent of the subdivision, but thinks there are reasonable alternatives available that should be examined, which might eliminate need for variances, such as the developer combining lots or some lot line adjustments. That would give ZBA guidance.

Mr. Congdon said that he didn't want people to have preconceived notions.

Mr. Bergman asked if he was content with alternatives being put into the record.

Mr. Congdon asked Mr. Stewart about his plans and Mr. Stewart was content to come back before the Board if he wants to subdivide again in a few years, as he only needs to build one house now.

Mr. Antis said that this needs several more months to go through the usual processes.

Mr. Congdon said he thought he might get a waiver for his preliminary hearing and Mr. Martin stated that it is too soon to say about that.

Chairman Zimmerman stated that they needed to wait until October to get a ZBA decision, make changes, and then set a public hearing for November. Even that would be moving pretty quickly.

Mr. Bergman asked whether the applicants want a resolution that says there are alternatives, or want to present it as it is now to the Zoning Board.

Mr. Arnold mentioned that conservation plans always show the ugliest possible plan, in order to make their plans look good, and what Mr. Congdon had presented reminded him of that approach.

Chairman Zimmerman reminded the applicant that they don't vote on Sketch Plans, and Mr. Congdon asked how they move forward. Chairman Zimmerman said that they would make the Resolution that they liked it, or wanted to recommend certain alternatives, as suggested already.

The principal concern Mr. Martin had heard tonight was the 2000+ ft driveway serving a single home. If an alternative could be found to that, it would be good for ZBA to consider it. Likewise there were possible changes to some other lot lines.

Mr. Congdon asked what kind of verbiage they would have.

Chairman Zimmerman stated they would provide a list of things they would like to see added or changed before it comes back, and Mr. Arnold pointed out that those are just suggestions at this point until he comes for preliminary approval.

Mr. Bouchard presented a list of concerns; that a Sketch Plan review be conducted and found in concert with Town's goals, and that reasonable alternatives exist. These include combining lots 2 & 3, thereby removing need for a Variance for Lot 3; and approaching the owner of the lot on Hatchery Road about a boundary line adjustment to remove the need for a Variance for Lot 1. So a Variance would only be needed for lot 5 or lot 4.

Mr. Martin stated that this would be an easier lift than how it started.

Mr. Arnold asked Mr. Bouchard because he had been on ZBA in the past and Mr. Bouchard agreed that the ZBA would appreciate this Board's input and give it weight in their decision.

Mr. Congdon expressed concern that it relies on another property owner and he can't necessarily do what they are asking. Also he didn't think it was actually feasible.

Mr. Bouchard explained that all he has to do is go ask that property owner. Mr. Congdon wanted to remove the word 'reasonable'. Mr. Bouchard explained that all Mr. Congdon has to do is show that he asked. Mr. Congdon thought that it would be expensive, and Mr. Bouchard explained that he was referring to a swap, that wouldn't be costly, and is just something to explore. The Board doesn't have to say anything to the ZBA he the applicant would prefer.

Mr. Martin pointed out that it doesn't tie them down to anything.

Mr. Congdon stated that under those circumstances he agreed.

Mr. Antis said that they need information on road construction, and easements shown on the plans. Mr. Arnold asked that the shared driveway be built to codes, and Mr. Congdon said they already had. That needs to be shown on the map. Distances, cross section detail of the surface, utility access locations. Chairman Zimmerman pointed out that the Fire/EMS referral needs to be redone, endangered species report, SHIPO.

The subdivision is called North Branch Brook.

Mr. Congdon presented a letter regarding a SPDES permit.

Mr. Bergman motioned to declare Lead Agency and Mr. Bouchard seconded. All in favor, no roll call motion carries.

Mr. Bouchard motioned that the Planning Board issue a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals as follows: That the Planning Board of the Town of Moreau conducted a Sketch Plan Review on September 16, 2019 of the proposed North Branch Brook project. The Planning Board finds the plan in concert with the Town's goals, as expressed in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The Planning Board also further finds that reasonable alternatives exist for the applicant to pursue. These include 1.) Combining Lots #2 & #3, thereby removing the need for a Variance for Lot #3. 2.) Approaching owner of existing 6.1 acre lot to explore a boundary adjustment that would provide 40 feet of road frontage to Lot #1. This would remove the need for a Variance for Lot #1. 3.) Use the proposed driveway to serve Lot #4 & 5. The driveway would be part of Lot #4.

Planning Board feel that the above actions, if achievable, would result in a Variance being needed for only Lot #5.

Mr. Antis seconded. Mr. Jensen wanted to clarify that this is not direction, simply a recommendation. Roll call vote resulted as follows: Mr. Bouchard, Yes; Mr. Antis, Yes; Mr. Arnold, Yes; Mr. Bergman, Yes; Mr. Shaver, Yes; Mr. Jensen, Yes; Chairman Zimmerman, Yes.

Mr. Arnold pointed out that the recommendation to approach the person with the 6.1 acres should be done and answered before the Zoning Board meeting, because that would move things along faster. Mr. Congdon pointed out that he had followed the Right to Farm Law when he created the subdivision. Mr. Bouchard stated that's why he introduced the recommendation saying that it was in concert with the Comprehensive Plan.

On Thursday Oct 3<sup>rd</sup> there will be a joint public meeting about new Zoning Law at 7:00pm. Members were encouraged to bring suggestions & concerns.

There was discussion about the solar development question and ways to address it. A 10% limit was suggested to keep the agricultural land from being turned into solar generation district.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:56 pm per motion by Mr. Bergman, and seconded by Mr. Antis. All in favor, motion carried, no roll call.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tricia S. Andrews