

A meeting of the Town of Moreau Planning Board was held on January 25, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. in the Town of Moreau Office Building, 351 Reynolds Road, Moreau, New York and via Zoom.

Peter Jensen	Chairperson
John Arnold	Planning Board Member
Erik Bergman	Planning Board Member
Jerry Bouchard	Planning Board Member
Mike Shaver	Planning Board Member
Ann Purdue, Esq.	Planning Board Member
Meredithe Mathias	Planning Board Member
Adam Seybolt	Alternate Planning Board member

Also present: Jim Martin, Zoning Administrator in person; Karla Buettner, Attorney for the Town; Tricia Andrews, recording Secretary

Absent: None

The meeting was called to order 7:00pm by Chairperson Jensen. The Board reviewed the minutes of the December 21, 2020 meeting. Corrections were made to references to planting shrubbery on the corner of Route 9 and Nolan Road, this is only for the Nolan Road side. Page 5, second paragraph down, Mrs. Mathias asked what happens to cars that don't sell, not Ms. Purdue. Ms. Purdue had made some corrections to typos and especially to the beginning of the William Smith discussion. Motion was made by Mr. Shaver and seconded by Mr. Bergman to approve the minutes with those corrections. All in favor, motion carried with no roll call.

#1 Route 9 Autoworld
Route 9
Public Hearing/Final Review

Travis Mitchell was representing. Bob Vittengl is also listening. Mr. Mitchell shared a screen with a presentation. This is on Route 9 at the intersection of Route 197 and Reynolds Road, 6 acres, C-1. It is a two-lot subdivision. The Route on the South west is 3.8, North is 2.6, Existing building is over the line on the proposed plot line, that building will need to be demolished. Have talked to DOT, they are in favor of shared curb cuts, they will get more involved in the configuration as it moves forward.

Jim asked whether the road would be built and the roadway dedicated, the building will be a problem. If and when it was effectively re-subdivided to dedicate the road, the structure would be removed.

Mr. Shaver asked about the overhead power lines and they are for. Mr. Mitchell said that there is no right-of-way on the survey, so that probably just internal. Mr. Martin agreed that if it were National Grid power there would be a right of way on the deed.

Mr. Martin asked Mr. Mitchell about the timeline. They would rather not demo the building on day one, so they would like to ask the Board for a delay or a stated timeline.

A meeting of the Town of Moreau Planning Board was held on January 25, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. in the Town of Moreau Office Building, 351 Reynolds Road, Moreau, New York and via Zoom.

Mr. Arnold asked if it could happen before the mylars are signed, which Mr. Mitchell thought would give them 6 months to bring them back for signature.

Mr. Bergman stated that it is a given that it has to come down so he is comfortable with flexibility on the date. Mr. Arnold agreed that it has to happen, as long as they don't draw the line before that is done. Mr. Bouchard stated that it is a strange situation, but they could agree to some kind of solution. Mr. Bergman suggested the demolition be required prior to filing with the County. Mr. Mitchell stated that if it were to be required before the mylars were done, they would have six months to file with the County and that would be enough.

Mr. Martin thought it could be conditionally approved for filing, but the mylars not signed until the demolition was completed. The signing of the mylars starts a 60-day period for filing with the County. Mr. Arnold asked whether stating when the mylars should be signed was appropriate and Mr. Martin thought that it was, even though that is not usually done.

Mr. Bouchard asked what time frame the applicant wanted and Mr. Mitchell thought that this conditional approval would be acceptable. Mr. Martin didn't want to leave the date open, so Mr. Mitchell asked for a year, and Mr. Martin said six months. Mr. Mitchell asked about 6 months with an opportunity to come in and ask the Board to extend for another six months if they couldn't get it done, and Board members indicated they agreed that would be acceptable.

Chairman Jensen asked if anyone had any questions, comments or concerns about Part I of the SEQR EAF, and none were raised. The Board proceeded to Part II. There were no findings. Mr. Bergman motioned to make a negative declaration for EAF for the Route 9 Autoworld Subdivision and Mr. Bouchard seconded. Roll call vote resulted as follows: Mr. Arnold, Yes; Mr. Bergman, Yes; Mr. Bouchard, Yes; Mr. Shaver, Yes; Ms. Purdue, Yes; Ms. Mathias, Yes; Mr. Jensen, Yes. All in favor, motion carried. Chairman Jensen read into the record the announcement about open meetings law to open the public hearing.

Mr. Martin asked the people present on the Zoom call whether they were present to discuss the Autoworld application. There was no response, so the public hearing was closed. Mr. Bouchard motioned to grant preliminary approval for the two-lot subdivision for Route 9 Autoworld on the condition that the building be demolished prior to the signature of the Chair and one other member on the mylars, and that the mylars be presented on or before July 24th 2021 unless an extension is granted by the Planning Board. Roll call vote resulted as follows: Mr. Arnold, Yes; Mr. Bergman, Yes; Mr. Bouchard, Yes; Mr. Shaver, Yes; Ms. Purdue, Yes; Ms. Mathias, Yes; Mr. Jensen, Yes. All in favor, motion carries. Mr. Arnold motioned to waive the 30-day requirement for separation between preliminary and final approval, and Ms. Purdue seconded. Roll call vote resulted as follows: Mr. Arnold, Yes; Mr. Bergman, Yes; Mr. Bouchard, Yes; Mr. Shaver, Yes; Ms. Purdue, Yes; Ms. Mathias, Yes; Mr. Jensen, Yes. All in favor, motion carries.

Motion to grant final approval to Route 9 Autoworld was made by Mr. Bouchard with the same conditions, and Mr. Bergman seconded. Roll call vote resulted as follows: Mr. Arnold, Yes; Mr. Bergman,

A meeting of the Town of Moreau Planning Board was held on January 25, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. in the Town of Moreau Office Building, 351 Reynolds Road, Moreau, New York and via Zoom.

Yes; Mr. Bouchard, Yes; Mr. Shaver, Yes; Ms. Purdue, Yes; Ms. Mathias, Yes; Mr. Jensen, Yes. All in favor, motion carries.

Motion was made by Mr. Arnold that the Chair and one other member sign the mylars when they are presented and the conditions are met, and Mr. Bouchard seconded.

#2 The Lawn Care
Route 9
Public Hearing/Site Plan Review

Mr. Whitbeck was present on the Zoom call.

Mr. Martin stated that the outstanding issues were the public hearing and a vegetative screen, widening the driveway, parking requirements, storage inside or contained, use of white noise backup alarms, hours of operation M-F 8-5:30 and Sat 8-2 for the office. Those items were to be added to the Site Plan. Mr. Martin met with Mr. Whitbeck in January and all those items have been added.

Mr. Martin stated that he was satisfied.

Chairman Jensen asked whether the Board had any questions and Ms. Purdue stated she didn't see the vegetative screen drawn in on Nolan Road, and would like to see the existing drive delineated separately from the proposed widened drive, and she also didn't see the marking for the split rail fence. Mr. Whitbeck stated that the split rail fence was there on an earlier map and he didn't add it all to the original because he felt it would be cluttered. Ms. Purdue stated that it has to be on the plan that they sign, and Mr. Martin agreed.

Ms. Purdue asked about the 4 parking spaces on the south side, which makes a total of 17. Mr. Whitbeck stated that he doesn't want the 4 on the Nolan Road side except for emergencies, and would rather use the other side. Ms. Purdue asked if that was enough room and Mr. Whitbeck stated that when they take the split rail fence out on the one side you would be able to go around the building with twenty feet on any side and space would not be a problem. Ms. Purdue asked if this was the first time they had included a trash container on the plan and Mr. Whitbeck stated it had been moved, and not added back in and said he would get it added. Ms. Purdue asked about the 2 x 4 retaining wall, and Mr. Whitbeck said that those are displays that will help keep people off the lawn. They get about 50 u-turns a day and they would like to keep people doing that closer to the road. Ms. Purdue stated that those concerns might require revisions.

Mr. Shaver asked whether they had hauled snow in and dumped it on the back of the property, and Mr. Whitbeck said that they had done that with the big storm last month, but normally would not and will not have room to do that again the future. They have a place in Gansevoort where they can do that.

Mr. Shaver asked about the storage tents and whether there was one or two, and Mr. Whitbeck stated that if he needed more he would be in touch with the Board. The tents will be added to the plan.

A meeting of the Town of Moreau Planning Board was held on January 25, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. in the Town of Moreau Office Building, 351 Reynolds Road, Moreau, New York and via Zoom.

This was advertised as a public hearing. Chairman Jensen read the governor's open meetings announcement again.

Mr. Martin asked for anyone present on the Zoom call to raise their hand or indicate in the chat box that they wanted to make a comment. There was no public comment and the public hearing was closed. Mr. Martin stated that this is a Type 2 action.

The Chair acknowledged that this is a Type 2 action and does not require SEQR.

Mr. Bergman motioned to approve with the following conditions: the delineation of the fence line along Route 9; a limit to two outdoor storage tents in site; that no snow be hauled in; that the entryway on Nolan Road before and after lines be added; the vegetative screen along Nolan Road, vegetation to be installed by May 15th.

Mr. Whitbeck asked for clarification on where the screening was going and Mr. Shaver stated he thought it was to be at the back on the Nolan Road side for neighbors. Mr. Whitbeck asked if that was behind the bins, along Nolan Road and Mr. Shaver agreed. There is a driveway on the corner of Pine Valley and Nolan and that house needs to be screened. Ms. Purdue pointed out that the vegetation probably can't go in until May. Mr. Whitbeck agreed that the end of May would work best for him; Mr. Bouchard had records that May 15th had been agreed upon. Second to the motion was made by Mr. Arnold. Roll call vote resulted as follows: Mr. Arnold, Yes; Mr. Bergman, Yes; Mr. Bouchard, Yes; Mr. Shaver, Yes; Ms. Purdue, Yes; Mrs. Mathias, Yes; Mr. Jensen, Yes. All in favor, motion carries.

Mr. Bouchard motioned that the Chair and one other member sign the mylars when they are presented and Mr. Bergman seconded. All in favor, motion carried with no roll call.

#3 William Smith/Carriage Traders

Route 9

Public Hearing/Site Plan Review

Mr. Smith was on the Zoom call. Mr. Martin explained that a revised plan was submitted, two spaces were deleted, hours of operation were added as well as a notation regarding not unloading and loading on Route 9 and no overnight parking of car haulers.

Ms. Purdue stated she is seeing cars very close to the roadway on the site which is not what is shown on the site plan. Mr. Romeo was on the call but not able to speak. Mr. Smith wondered if it was an issue with snow but stated that the Site Plan doesn't say where to park. Mr. Romeo stated via chat that the cars are in the same place as day one, but he will take a look, and that the haulers don't have a problem getting in. Mr. Smith agreed with this. Mrs. Mathias stated there was an aesthetic reason to keep the cars back from the road.

Mr. Martin asked what the distance was per the site plan, Chairman Jensen stated it was about 75 feet.

Mr. Smith stated he didn't remember there ever being a discussion of how far back the cars had to be.

From his perspective they just needed enough room for the car hauler to lower.

Mr. Martin called Mr. Martin's phone so that he could speak.

A meeting of the Town of Moreau Planning Board was held on January 25, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. in the Town of Moreau Office Building, 351 Reynolds Road, Moreau, New York and via Zoom.

Mr. Arnold stated that although the lines were not drawn on the grass and gravel, the drawings denoted a distance between the road and the first row of cars.

Mr. Smith stated that they could not remove the first row of cars, and the cars are not closer that they have always been.

Mr. Shaver agreed the cars had not moved, but stated that the map does not accurately show what's happening.

Mr. Arnold stated that visibility on Route 9 was not a priority as this was not a sales lot.

Mr. Romeo stated that they never discussed anything about how close they were to the road and they didn't want to keep the cars a certain amount of feet back.

Ms. Purdue stated that she had evaluated it per the drawing and that it looks better when they are back.

Mr. Smith stated it was not up to the curb because they wouldn't be able to get a car hauler back there.

Ms. Purdue stated the vehicles are clearly closer to the road than shown on the Site Plan, but apologized if she had mistakenly exaggerated their location.

Mr. Romeo stated that there is sufficient area for the car haulers to pull in and out and that is all they were trying to accomplish. He apologized if the scale was off. He didn't want to put the cars against the back wall as it is a car lot. Mr. Smith stated that a buffer at the back had been added and an access drive widened from 6 to 15 feet, so that may have caused the cars to be moved forward. Perhaps in the summer they could move them back somewhat. Mr. Romeo agreed with this.

Ms. Purdue asked whether the applicant agreed that the Site Plan was inaccurate.

Mr. Martin guessed that the scale was about 60 feet. Mr. Romeo stated he did not want to negotiate where he could park cars in a transport lot. If it's wrong he asked for forgiveness but also said he didn't think this was fair.

Mr. Arnold stated he was confused. It was clear at the beginning that this is storage and not showroom. So it should not be compared to vehicles on display at Carriage Traders for sale. These are not for people to look at. Mr. Romeo agreed that this was correct but stated that for marketing purposes he didn't want the cars off the road. These are sold cars ready to be transported. But Mr. Romeo doesn't want to own property where he doesn't decide where to put the cars.

Mr. Shaver suggested they correct the drawing to show where the cars really are. Mr. Romeo stated he had no problem with that.

Mr. Smith asked if they wanted the parking spaces moved closer to Route 9.

Ms. Purdue stated she thought the Site Plan they had submitted was fine but that they weren't abiding by it.

Mr. Smith stated that no one had ever said how far off the road they had to be, the only issue was fitting a car hauler in there, and now it's being brought up. Lines on a parking lot don't make people park in the lines. Mr. Romeo stated again that the cars have not moved.

Mr. Martin asked whether the Board was happy with the cars close to the road or not and Mr. Purdue stated she does not. Mr. Bouchard stated that they had not had the scale on the drawing until now, because it was just requested at the last meeting. 13/16th = 18 ft is the scale and he doesn't know what that

A meeting of the Town of Moreau Planning Board was held on January 25, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. in the Town of Moreau Office Building, 351 Reynolds Road, Moreau, New York and via Zoom.

translates into but he looked at it and expected it to reflect reality. It is important to him that car carriers can get off the road safely. Drawings have to reflect what is made.

Mr. Smith stated that Mr. Rourke's initial drawing had shown cars back off the road more, and this one shows them closer. He asked who is measuring off the curb? Is anyone doing that? This is just from driving by.

Mr. Arnold stated that the drawing under consideration now shows the front row of cars are 130 ft from the back line of the property, and asked whether that is where they are now. The applicants stated they had no measured it. Mr. Arnold stated that if the applicants are stating they don't intend to follow the site plan then the Board can't in good conscience approve it.

Mr. Romeo asked whether he could revise the plan, which he had drawn just to show how many cars they could fit and not exactly where they would put them.

Mr. Arnold asked how deep the lot is. Mr. Smith said it is 172 feet deep. So to follow the current plan, Mr. Arnold thought the front row of cars was approximately 40 feet off Route 9, and asked the applicant if they could work with that. Mr. Smith stated he could not answer that. Mr. Romeo stated that it is not out of the question but he would want to measure it before he agreed to it.

Mr. Smith stated that there are two 15 ft driveways as well.

Mr. Arnold did the math to show where he could get 40 feet in the front, and if that is unreasonable then they need a new drawing.

Mr. Romeo asked if they Board would approve a plan where they could park wherever they want.

Mr. Arnold asked if he was proposing just to show ingress and egress.

Mr. Martin said there was no magic to the car hauler being in front but it could go in the back. But he thought they should commit to where they were going to load and unload. Mr. Romeo stated that he would keep it safe but didn't want to be pigeon-holed.

Mr. Romeo said he would do that at the back.

Mr. Martin said that they need to have a Site Plan that reflects what is happening.

Mr. Romeo stated he didn't want to sign something that says he can't put cars right up the road.

Mr. Shaver suggested that a new Site Plan might be necessary and Mr. Romeo agreed. Mr. Arnold stated he liked the plan as it sits right now. Mr. Romeo can always change it if he changes the use of the lot later. If Mr. Romeo is happy to wait another month, he can show the cars closer to the road. But what the Board approved has to be what is going to be done. Mr. Romeo stated that he wants to be able to do whatever he wants. He would rather wait another month and get it right.

Mr. Arnold expressed concern that the next plan is still going to show vehicles in certain locations.

Mr. Romeo stated he could creatively get involved.

Mr. Martin stated they have a 100 car limit and they have some freedom. As long as the loading and unloading areas are safe to enter and exit the highway, the car storage might be somewhat more free. Mr. Romeo stated he hadn't realized this needed to be addressed. Mr. Shaver stated that what they are doing has been working as he has never seen a truck having trouble getting in and out and he passes often. Mr. Arnold stated that the 40 feet he had counted should be plenty, and 25 feet should be plenty too.

A meeting of the Town of Moreau Planning Board was held on January 25, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. in the Town of Moreau Office Building, 351 Reynolds Road, Moreau, New York and via Zoom.

Mr. Romeo asked if he did park too close to the road, but nowhere near the truck access, would someone come to him and tell him that he can't do that?

Mr. Arnold stated that if he wanted a short-term parking area he could put that on the drawing and Mr. Romeo stated that that might work. Mr. Arnold reiterated that the point is getting the trucks safely away from traffic.

Mr. Bouchard asked whether it was accurate to say that they want to submit a plan with a general parking area for up to 100 cars with all discretion to Mr. Romeo about how to park them. There would be a loading unloading area for car carriers on the plan, and that he wants to be able to park cars right up to the property line. Mr. Bouchard asked whether Board members were comfortable with that plan.

Mr. Arnold asked for clarification. Additional loading areas were discussed. Mr. Arnold proposed that the Board stipulate 8 spaces on the south end and 4 spaces on the north end to stage things for haul out, and given him freedom elsewhere.

Mr. Romeo stated he was fine with that. Mr. Arnold asked how the Board felt about that. These are separate spaces that are not part of the 100 spaces and are not more cars. Ms. Purdue was still concerned about safe parking off the roadway and Mr. Smith stated there is a curb there. No curb is shown on the map.

Mr. Arnold stated that if this is approved they should show the load out spaces and the Board can approve it conditionally. It could be a shaded area for 'up to 4 cars' and 'up to 8 cars'. Mr. Bouchard stated there are 100 ways to do this. This plan can represent one possible option.

Ms. Purdue stated that they can act on this tonight if they followed Mr. Arnold's suggestions. Mr. Bouchard agreed that he wanted setbacks. Mr. Romeo wanted the setback to be where the curbs already are. Mr. Bouchard stated that this is just for the current use and Mr. Arnold agreed.

Chairman Jensen opened the public hearing. There were no members of the public present for this issue. Chairman Jensen closed the public hearing and stated that this is a Type 2 action not subject to SEQR. Ms. Purdue asked Mr. Smith and Mr. Romeo to confirm that they are agreeable to what Mr. Arnold had proposed. Mr. Romeo stated that he was agreeable to the two areas in the front for 8 cars and 4 cars for staging.

Mr. Arnold stated that the final site plan should reflect the addition of an 8 space loading area on the southwest corner and a 4 space parking area on the north end. Motion to approve was made Mr. Arnold and seconded by Mr. Bouchard. Roll call vote resulted as follows: Mr. Arnold, Yes; Mr. Bergman, Yes; Mr. Bouchard, No; Mr. Shaver, No; Ms. Purdue, Yes; Ms. Mathias, No; Mr. Jensen, Yes. All in favor, motion carries 4-3.

Ms. Purdue asked why members had voted no and Mrs. Mathias stated it was too loose for her comfort level. Mr. Romeo said that this was getting ridiculous and the Board assured him that the motion had passed.

Motion was made by Mr. Arnold and seconded by Mr. Bergman that the Chair and one other member sign the mylars when they are presented. All in favor motion carries.

A meeting of the Town of Moreau Planning Board was held on January 25, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. in the Town of Moreau Office Building, 351 Reynolds Road, Moreau, New York and via Zoom.

#4 Arrowhead Meadows
60 Bluebird Road
Preliminary Review

Travis Mitchell presenting with Marybeth Slevin. 22 acre site, to the left is Route 9 to the north is Bluebird Road with frontage, and Gansevoort Road on the west. Partially in R-1 and Partially in R-2, mostly R-1. 44 lots, plans have not changed since December but there was discussion of a combined traffic study with a neighboring subdivision. A traffic study has already been done but they did go to the engineer and ask them to include all the projects, and that has been resubmitted. It includes one at the corner of Gansevoort Road and Route 197, and one at Bluebird Road and Fort Edward Road. The combined effects of these projects was found not to lower the level of service in that area. He anticipates that this study will go to the Town's traffic engineer as well.

There was discussion last time about how to do SEQR when there are two separate projects and they feel that each should be considered separately. The other projects are referenced in the SEQR Long Form to facilitate this. An overall map has been provided with the cross-easements showing how they can be constructed independently. He described how either could be done first. There was also discussion of shared stormwater and the easement allows that to be treated in storm basins on the other property with the proper easements in place, and that is shown.

Mail distribution was also discussed in December. Locations for mail stations have been shown, but Mr. Mitchell has also heard that the decentralized distribution might be allowed after all, so that remains to be decided. Mr. Martin had advised that street names were needed in addition to decision about mail. There is a larger discussion to be had about centralized sewer.

Tonight they would like County referral, SEQR review begun, and a public hearing set.

Mr. Arnold asked whether it is accurate to say that the stormwater can be treated off site. Mr. Martin agreed that it can be if the structure supports it, including easements etc. He referred the question to Atty. Buettner if she wanted to chime in. Mr. Mitchell said that there is a question in the NOI about discharge but it doesn't preclude cooperating with a neighboring property. Mr. Arnold noted that there is only a single point of connection with the Recreation Park, so he wondered if an area of connection to Jacobie north could be added. Then the Board could ask for a connection from Jacobie when it comes before them again. Mr. Mitchell stated he couldn't ask them to do that and Mr. Arnold stated the Board would ask them. Mr. Mitchell said that the homeowners' association lands around this can be worked on to make this happen. Mr. Arnold asked him to show that potential. He would like them to allow the opportunity, and that is the most the Board can do. Mr. Bouchard and Mr. Bergman agreed that this is a good idea. Mr. Bergman asked if it could be rough-ed in. Mr. Mitchell said he would put that on his HOA lands.

Mr. Arnold asked about the mailboxes. Mr. Mitchell said that he had heard in the last few weeks that the postmaster in this area is still in favor of individual mailboxes and he has not explored that yet.

A meeting of the Town of Moreau Planning Board was held on January 25, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. in the Town of Moreau Office Building, 351 Reynolds Road, Moreau, New York and via Zoom.

Mr. Arnold asked whether the school bus would go into this development or want a location by the road.

Mr. Mitchell said that as it is Town Road with no dead-ends he thinks they will. Mr. Arnold agreed.

Mr. Mitchell explained that they don't pick up at the nearby apartment complexes because those are private roads. Mr. Shaver asked if they are 8 inch water mains or 6 and Mr. Mitchell said they would be 8, there is water on Route 32 and Bluebird Road. This will be sent on to Highway, Water, Traffic study. Mr. Shaver asked whether it would go to engineer for the water. Motion to forward to traffic consultants to their review and create associated escrow was made by Mrs. Mathias and seconded by Mr. Bergman. All in favor, motion carries with no roll call. Mr. Mitchell asked whether they Board had enough information to start coordinated review.

Atty. Buettner stated that the SEQR should be done separately for the two projects, the Planning Board should declare Lead Agency if they wish to start that. Part I states that they are not going into the sewer district, she doesn't think they have all the information to declare that cost-prohibitive and the Town would like them to look into that further because they would like them to join that. Mr. Mitchell agreed that the sewer is not off the table, and agreed he may have been given wrong information but is reluctant to have that hold this up. Atty. Buettner stated it was not wrong information but incomplete and she wanted the Board to be aware that the possibility was still open. She advised the Board to declare Lead Agency and proceed with two separate SEQR reviews. Ms. Purdue asked for information about coordinated review and Atty. Buettner stated that letters go to the involved agencies listed in the EAF and they have 30 days to respond whether they agree with the Planning Board being Lead Agency, and they usually don't respond or don't disagree with that. Then the SEQR review occurs.

Ms. Purdue asked what timeline Mr. Mitchell had and he stated that they will probably not file their maps until late summer so the construction would be in 2022, maybe late 2021. He isn't sure about SHR-TJM but it would not be too far behind this one. Mr. Martin listed the agencies DEC, DOH, DOT and the Attorney General for the HOA. Mr. Martin added County DPW, County Planning. Chairman Jensen added the school district.

Mr. Shaver asked about the school district and Atty. Buettner explained that a sewer district extension would be beneficial and they would all be consolidated eventually. If the applicant is agreeable, the map plan report will have to be submitted to the Town Board for approval for that before this Board can approve it. It shouldn't be a lengthy project, but it does involve a public hearing. It is in the Comprehensive Plan to get as many projects connected to the sewer district as possible.

Mr. Arnold asked why the DEC would be included. That is for the stormwater planning. Mr. Arnold asked about soil types and Mr. Mitchell stated they have done a couple dozen test pits and perc tests and it is typical Moreau sand.

Motion to declare Lead Agency for SEQR was made by Mr. Arnold and seconded by Mrs. Mathias. All in favor, motion carried with no roll call.

Mr. Martin asked for two more paper copies of the plans and a set on drives for the County.

Mr. Mitchell asked whether the Board would schedule the public hearing and Chair stated that they had not heard from consultants so it might be premature, and Mr. Martin agreed.

A meeting of the Town of Moreau Planning Board was held on January 25, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. in the Town of Moreau Office Building, 351 Reynolds Road, Moreau, New York and via Zoom.

#5 SRH-TJM, LLC
552-554 Gansevoort Road
Preliminary Review

This item was tabled at the applicant's request.

#6 Lee Horning
Route 9
Site Plan Review

Lee Horning was present over Zoom and is proposing a building on 1496 Route 9 which is currently residential in a Commercial Zone and he would like to turn it into a commercial rental space. He has done some improvements. He has a drywell for parking area which he hopes to blacktop, a handicap access ramp to the front door, and an arborvitae fence between this and the bar/restaurant to North. The drawing shows the septic tank, access holes, leach bed. All in good shape. He has shown proposed additions to building out back, any structure the tenant would need. He intends to rent to an insurance or other commercial office that doesn't have customers going in regularly.

The leach pit is existing. It has been inspected and seems to be fine.

Mr. Martin stated this is a Type 2 action under 1000 square feet with no SEQR required. The existing building is 33 ft long by 25 ft deep. It has 800 sq ft of useable space inside. 6 parking spaces are proposed. He anticipates three or four spaces for employees and one or two for walk-in customers.

Ms. Purdue asked if that is the correct number of spaces and Mr. Martin said he couldn't calculate it because he didn't know the use, and said if it were offices this number would be sufficient but if it were retail, that would likely not be enough. Mr. Horning stated he has space out back to expand parking if needed. Mr. Arnold stated he could show banked parking.

Mrs. Mathias stated she would like him to keep the turnaround.

Ms. Purdue stated that if he wanted to build accessory buildings he would have to come back with the specifics, and Mr. Horning stated he wouldn't mind that. The Chairman asked if this is a business that rents space, so it is all one use. Mr. Martin asked if he plans to have one tenant or multiple, and he plans to have one.

Mr. Arnold stated the building is 825 sq ft, and asked what would be the max parking for that if it were retail. Mr. Martin referred to the Code and stated that it is one space per 100 sq ft in retail and 1 per 300 ft in office space. So they are a couple spaces short if it were retail. Mr. Arnold proposed adding a couple spaces that would show on the plan but would only have to be built if they did a retail use. Mr. Horning said that he would show the two additional spaces, but preferred not to add blacktop. Chairman Jensen advised he did not need to change the parking unless he got a retail tenant and needed it.

Mr. Bouchard said that the 4 x 3 foot sign should just say 'sign location' because he will have to get a separate sign permit. Board members stated that the site looks good.

A meeting of the Town of Moreau Planning Board was held on January 25, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. in the Town of Moreau Office Building, 351 Reynolds Road, Moreau, New York and via Zoom.

Mrs. Mathias motioned to schedule a public hearing for February meeting and Mr. Bouchard seconded. All in favor motion carried no roll call. Mr. Martin reminded the applicant that for next month he should just add the parking spaces and put 'sign as per permit requirements' and Ms. Purdue added he should eliminate future expansion.

Mr. Arnold used Mr. Horning's map to point out to Mr. Martin a small parcel about which he had always had a question, and Mr. Martin told him that his question would have to go to the assessor. Mr. Martin did not think that a sign board on the property could move it to a different classification. Mr. Martin said he could look into it.

The Chair asked Mr. Martin to forward Mr. Horning's application to Saratoga County.

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made at 9: 56pm by Mr. Bouchard and seconded by Mr. Shaver. All in favor, motion carried, no roll call.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia S. Andrews