

**George Leveille**  
*Chairman*

**Nicholas Behuniak**  
*Member*

**Thomas Coffey**  
*Member*

**Christine Motta**  
*Member*

**Kate Powers**  
*Member*

**Stephen Rice**  
*Member*

**John Smolinsky**  
*Member*

**TOWN OF BETHLEHEM**  
*Albany County - New York*  
**PLANNING BOARD**  
445 DELAWARE AVENUE  
DELMAR, NEW YORK 12054  
(518) 439-4955, Ext. 1159  
(518) 439-5808 Fax

**Sam Messina**  
*Town Supervisor*

**Michael Morelli**  
*Director of DEDP*

**Jeffrey Lipnicky**  
*Town Planner*

**Robert Leslie**  
*Senior Planner*

**Terrence W. Ritz**  
*Asst. Engineer, L.S.*

**Keith Silliman**  
*Counsel*

**Deborah Kitchen**  
*Assistant to the Board*

**MINUTES**  
**August 17, 2010**

1 A meeting of the Town of Bethlehem Planning Board was convened in public session in the Bethlehem  
2 Town Hall, 445 Delaware Ave., Delmar, NY at 6:00 p.m., on Tuesday, August 17, 2010. Attendance was  
3 recorded as follows:  
4

<u>Board Members Present</u>	<u>Board Members Absent</u>	<u>Counsel Present</u>	<u>Town Staff Present</u>
George Leveille		Keith Silliman	Michael Morelli
Nicholas Behuniak			Jeffrey Lipnicky
Thomas Coffey			Robert Leslie
Christine Motta			Terrence Ritz
Kate Powers			Deborah Kitchen
Stephen Rice			
John Smolinsky			

5

<u>Others Present</u>			
Shawn Bray	Glen Valentine	Fred Richter	Charles Preska
Thomas Butler	Ted Zabinski	Peter Ebert	Amanda Wolfe
Francis Bossolini	James Feil	James Loder	Pieter Wolfe
Steve Bolduc	Bob Bolduc	Keri Bolduc	
Michael Tucker	Scott Wallant	Louie Lecce	

6  
7 Chairman Leveille called the meeting to order and noted the presence of a quorum.

8  
9 **Public Comment on Regular Agenda Items**

- 10 • Mesiti (Subdivision-Minor)  
11 • Speeder Road (Site Plan)  
12 • Bridge Street (Site Plan)  
13 • ESCO Towers (Site Plan/Special Use Permit)  
14 • Vertstandig's Townhomes (Site Plan Amendment)

15  
16 There was no public comment on regular agenda items.

17  
18 **Public Hearing – South Albany Airport (Site Plan / Special Use Permit)**

19 Chairman Leveille stated that the August 17<sup>th</sup> public hearing notice was mailed to nearby residents and  
20 posted on the Town's website and bulletin board. Unfortunately, the meeting notice did not appear in the  
21 August 11<sup>th</sup> issue of The Spotlight. As a result, the Board will open the public hearing on August 17<sup>th</sup> to  
22 allow those in attendance to speak; and then adjourn the hearing to September 7<sup>th</sup>. It was noted that the  
23 September 7<sup>th</sup> public hearing notice is expected to appear in the September 1<sup>st</sup> issue of The Spotlight.

24  
25 Chairman Leveille called for a motion to forgo the reading of the August 17<sup>th</sup> public hearing notice and  
26 indent it into the minutes. A motion was offered by Mr. Behuniak, seconded by Ms. Motta, and approved  
27 by all Members present.  
28

29 Notice is hereby given that the PLANNING BOARD of the TOWN OF BETHLEHEM, Albany  
30 County, NY, will hold a PUBLIC HEARING on Tuesday, August 17, 2010 at 6:00 p.m., at the Town  
31 Offices, 445 Delaware Ave., Delmar, NY, on the application of South Albany Airport Corporation, 6  
32 Old School Road, Selkirk, NY 12158, for a Special Use Permit, for project as shown on a map entitled  
33 "Aircraft Maintenance Hangar, South Albany Airport", dated June 2010, submitted by the Capital  
34 District Office of Passero Associates, 3 Franklin Square, Suite 7, Saratoga Springs, NY 12866.  
35 Individuals with disabilities who are in need of an accommodation in order to participate should  
36 contact the Town Clerk's Office at 439-4955, Ext. 1183. Advanced notice is requested.  
37

38 Ted Zabinski, President of the South Albany Airport Corporation and Shawn Bray of Passero Associates,  
39 were present to provide information and answer questions. The South Albany Airport is seeking approval  
40 to construct a 5,800 sq. ft. pre-manufactured steel frame aircraft maintenance hangar and apron at the South  
41 Albany Airport. The project last appeared before the Board on July 20, 2010, at which time the State  
42 Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) Resolution - Classification of Action and Negative Declaration  
43 was approved. Since that time, the applicant submitted a revised Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan  
44 (SWPPP). Draft approval documents have been prepared by staff in anticipation of possible action at the  
45 September 7<sup>th</sup> meeting. Conditions of approval will include recommendations made by the Albany County  
46 Planning Board and Albany County Department of Public Works.  
47

48 There were no public comments. Chairman Leveille called for a motion to adjourn the public hearing and  
49 reopen it again on Tuesday, September 7, 2010. A motion was offered by Mr. Behuniak, seconded by Mr.  
50 Rice and unanimously approved by all Members present, the public hearing was adjourned.  
51

#### 52 **Mesiti Subdivision, Oakwood Road, Glenmont**

53 Mr. Lipnicky stated that the applicant, Paul Mesiti, is seeking approval for a four lot subdivision. In a  
54 memo to the Board, dated August 10, 2010 Mr. Lipnicky states that the primary constraint to development  
55 of the parcel is the presence of Federal regulatory wetland. The applicant has obtained both a Wetland  
56 Permit authorization from the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) and Water Quality Certification from the  
57 NYS Department of Environmental Conservation. A SEQR Determination of Significance Negative  
58 Declaration was issued for the project on November 17, 2009. A public hearing was held on December 1,  
59 2009. The project last appeared before the Planning Board on January 19, 2010 at which time, the Board  
60 decided to table the application pending receipt of additional information. The Board also directed staff to  
61 work with the applicant to explore an alternate proposal for a three lot subdivision. Subsequently, staff met  
62 with the applicant's engineer and the applicant has submitted materials requested by the Town. The Board  
63 will need to determine whether the materials submitted by the applicant adequately address the issues and  
64 concerns raised by the Board. Staff has prepared a draft Preliminary Plat Approval document and draft  
65 Parkland/Park Fee Resolution for the Board's consideration.  
66

67 Francis Bossolini of Ingalls and Associates was present on behalf of the applicant to provide information and  
68 answer questions. Mr. Bossolini noted that he and Mr. Lipnicky have worked hard to resolve outstanding  
69 issues. With regard to density calculations, the Town came up with 4.5 units. The applicant feels they are  
70 well within the constraints of the Town's Zoning ordinance with respect to lot area and project density. With  
71 regard to an access easement, there was communication between Town staff and the ACOE related to  
72 wetland mitigation. There is a five year reporting period required as a condition of the permit. A monitoring  
73 plan will have to be prepared on an annual basis. Mr. Bossolini has read through the suggested resolution  
74 related to a planting plan and pedestrian pathways. The applicant is amenable to installing plantings that  
75 might help to define a pathway. With regard to reducing the number of lots from four to three, the applicant  
76 does not feel that the impact on the viewshed would be lessened enough to warrant jeopardizing the  
77 economics of the project. A substantial part of the parcel will remain undeveloped because of the topography

78 and constrained lands located on site. A retaining wall was constructed by the neighbors to create a  
79 driveway. The applicant was unable to determine the nature of the vibration reported by the neighbor.  
80

81 Mr. Smolinsky stated that he regrets that the Town and the Army Corps of Engineers did not consider a  
82 three lot subdivision at the beginning of the process because there might have been less intrusion /  
83 mitigation with regard to the wetlands, and less of an economic impact. He stated that he would be willing  
84 to approve the project with conditions such as a temporary easement for wetland monitoring, walking path,  
85 street trees and surety bond as noted in Mr. Lipnicky's memo to the Board.  
86

87 In response to a question raised about sidewalks, Mr. Lipnicky stated that the Town is looking at an  
88 easement along Oakwood Road. There is sufficient depth from the edge of pavement right now to  
89 accommodate a sidewalk in the future if at some point in time that stretch of road becomes a priority. At  
90 this time, there are many other streets in Town that would be a much higher priority than Oakwood Road.  
91 People assume ownership of land that is in the Town's right of way. The Town is not suggesting that the  
92 applicant build a path. The applicant is being asked to define a pedestrian pathway by installing trees or  
93 fencing along the right of way. The surety bond is being required to ensure that the water line  
94 improvement will be made.  
95

96 Upon motion by Ms. Powers, seconded by Mr. Behuniak, and unanimously approved by all Members  
97 present, the Parkland Resolution was approved.  
98

99 Upon motion by Mr. Coffey, seconded by Mr. Motta, and unanimously approved by all Members present,  
100 the Preliminary Plat (245-P) was approved, as amended.  
101

### 102 **30 Speeder Road, Selkirk, NY – Site Plan Application**

103 Mr. Morelli stated that the applicant, Pieter Wolfe of Wolfe Construction, is seeking approval to construct a  
104 30' x 87' (2,610 sq. ft.) addition onto the east side of an existing 10,440 sq. ft. warehouse building currently  
105 leased by Callanan Industries, Inc. The Board previously granted site plan approval (February 2009) for  
106 construction of a fuel dispensing station for vehicles operated by Callanan. The project will be referred to the  
107 Albany County Planning Board for consideration at their August 19, 2010 meeting because the parcel abuts a  
108 State highway. With regard to SEQR, staff is recommending that the project be considered a Type II action  
109 pursuant to Section 615.5 (7) (construction or expansion of a non-residential structure or facility involving  
110 less than 4,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area). Type II actions have been determined not to have a significant  
111 impact on the environment and are therefore not subject to environmental review. Comments generated by  
112 the Engineering Division will be discussed with the applicant.  
113

114 Pieter Wolfe of Wolfe Builders was present to provide information and answer questions. He stated that  
115 the proposed addition will provide space that is needed for mechanical work and storage.  
116

117 Upon motion of Mr. Behuniak, seconded by Mr. Smolinsky, and approved by all Members present, the Board  
118 voted to consider the project a Type II action, thereby concluding the environmental review.  
119

### 120 **109 Bridge Street, Selkirk, NY – Site Plan Application**

121 Paul Hite LLS was present on behalf of the applicant, Peter Ebert of SP &E LLC to provide information  
122 and answer questions. He stated that applicant is seeking approval to construct a 80 x 100 (8,000 sq. ft.)  
123 garage to store heavy equipment that is currently stored outdoors. The equipment is used to repair /  
124 maintain railroad tracks and cars off site. Indoor storage will allow the tenant to increase response time  
125 during inclement weather. The project will be referred to the Albany County Planning Board for  
126 consideration at their August 19, 2010 meeting because the parcel abuts a State highway.  
127

128 The project is located in a Heavy Industrial Zoning District where a garage use is subject to site plan  
129 approval. The proposed septic system has been approved by the Albany County Department of Health. A  
130 stormwater management plan was submitted to the Engineering Division and comments have been  
131 generated. Water is accessible along Bridge Street. The Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) granted a

132 variance to the applicant (June 2010) for front yard setback adjacent to the parking area, and side/rear yard  
133 setback for relief from the required additional 100-foot setback for projects adjacent to a residential zoning  
134 district. A condition of the variance requires the applicant to provide landscaping in the setback areas,  
135 north / northeastern property lines. Landscaping will be used to screen the project from adjacent residential  
136 zoning districts. It should be noted that the owners of the DeCastro property (northeastern property line)  
137 have indicated they prefer to keep the screening limited.

138  
139 Following a discussion related to plantings, the Board directed Mr. Leslie to work with Mr. Hite to develop  
140 a landscaping plan. The Board will need to consider elevations and comments generated by the Town's  
141 Engineering Division and Albany County Planning Board.

142  
143 Upon motion of Mr. Rice, seconded by Mr. Coffey, and approved by all Members present, the Board voted to  
144 table further discussion of the project.

145  
146 **75 Van Dyke Road, Delmar, NY - ESCO Towers (Site Plan/Special Use Permit)**

147 Mr. Leslie stated that the project last appeared before the Planning Board on July 6, 2010. A balloon test  
148 was successfully completed on July 30 and July 31, 2010 where readings were taken at 10 minute intervals.  
149 With regard to SEQR, the applicant has submitted a request to reduce the review height from 150 feet to  
150 120-feet. The proposed tower would still be expandable to 150-feet. The law requires the Town to  
151 consider segmentation. The Board will need to determine if segmentation will be an issue if the review  
152 height is stayed at 120 feet. With regard to visual analysis, the LA group, Landscape Architecture and  
153 Engineering, P.C., prepared a visual assessment of the proposed 120 foot tower. The assessment provides  
154 an evaluation of all three tower types (lattice tower, monopole, monopine). It is noted that certain photo  
155 locations, include existing evergreen trees that would limit the visibility of the monopine. The assessment  
156 concludes that a monopole would be the least visible structure on the site.

157  
158 Adam Walters, of Phillips Lytle LLP was present on behalf of the applicants (Thomas Butler & James  
159 Loder, of ESCO Towers Inc.) to provide information and answer questions. Charles Preska, the property  
160 owner, was also present. Mr. Walters stated that the applicant submitted a comprehensive response to  
161 comments which included results of the balloon test and a visual impact report with photo simulations of  
162 three tower types (lattice tower, monopole, monopine). The applicant also submitted an analysis of  
163 performance standards; drawings/specifications for the equipment shelter; information about the back-up  
164 generators; wetland certification, build out plans from both carriers; and a letter from the property owner  
165 qualifying his intentions for the tree area. Mr. Preska has indicated that he is amenable to increasing the  
166 size of the lease area to include an additional 31 trees.

167  
168 A 120 foot tower would place the height of the lightning rod at 125 feet. A review by the Town's  
169 consultant, Ronald Graiff, indicates that without consideration for future co-locators or no consideration for  
170 the need for additional towers or structures, the minimum height necessary for the proposed facility is 110  
171 feet AGL, assuming AT&T would locate with an antenna center of radiation at 110 feet and Verizon  
172 Wireless would locate with an antenna center of radiation of 100 feet. Mr. Butler stated that Sprint has  
173 indicated that they do not have any build plans for the Town of Bethlehem. Mr. Walters stated that a  
174 monopine tower needs to be taller than a monopole or lattice tower in order to simulate the shape of a pine  
175 tree. The height of the tower fluctuates based on the minimum height necessary to overcome the radio  
176 frequency coverage gap. Mr. Leslie noted that the additional height needed for a monopine would be  
177 mitigation for reducing the visual impacts. Independent Towers is seeking approval to construct a cell  
178 tower within a mile of the ESCO Tower. The Town's consultant has indicated that either site could meet  
179 the requirements of all respective carriers.

180  
181 Chairman Leveille stated that the Planning Board is considering two applications and the cumulative  
182 effects of each application. He asked the Members to express their opinion and /or preference for tower  
183 sites, SEQR determination of 120 foot tower, size of lease area, and type of tower.

184

185 Mr. Coffey stated that he thought the balloon test was helpful. He questioned the reasoning behind floating  
186 a balloon at 150 feet. He stated that he prefers the ESCO proposal because there is an opportunity to  
187 preserve farmland. Mr. Rice and Ms. Powers concurred. Mr. Smolinsky stated that he prefers the  
188 Independent Tower site with a monopine design because it will blend in better. He is not enamored about  
189 saving the farmland because he does not see a formal commitment to preservation, i.e., conservation  
190 easement. The property is zoned residential and can be developed as such. He believes the Independent  
191 Tower site provides a community benefit for the entire town not just one tax payer who has not made a  
192 commitment to retain the property as open space. He acknowledged that the increased lease area was a  
193 good thing. Mr. Behuniak stated that he was not crazy about either site but sees pros and cons for both. He  
194 appreciated the balloon test at 150' and agrees with Mr. Smolinsky that there is not a firm commitment on  
195 the part of the landowner for the preservation of farmland. He appreciates certain changes that have been  
196 made to the proposal and would be more inclined to lean toward the ESCO site if there was greater  
197 commitment on the part of the landowner. He noted, at this time, the Independent Tower site provides a  
198 greater revenue benefit for tax payers.

199  
200 Chairman Leveille asked if there were any remaining issues related to the issue of segmentation if the  
201 height of the tower is stayed at 120 feet. He noted that an extension of the tower would require further  
202 review by the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). The Board determined it is not  
203 segmentation to limit the scope of the SEQR process to the height of 120 feet. He noted that the Board is  
204 leaning toward the ESCO application and suggested that staff begin to prepare the SEQR documentation.  
205 Mr. Leslie asked for clarification with regard to the type of tower the Board prefers.

206  
207 Chairman Leveille stated that he is very familiar with the area. He believes the ESCO site is uniquely  
208 situated and is superior in terms of less impact on the viewshed. He stated that when the idea of preserving  
209 farmland was cultivated in the comprehensive plan it was not the Town's intent to require conservation  
210 easements and deed restrictions but rather to create a toolbox for agricultural land owners to try and keep  
211 the viability of farming through additional sources of income on their property. The intent was to provide  
212 tools to large landowners, like Mr. Preska, so they could find value in their undeveloped land. He  
213 understands that the property is zoned residential but does not believe a 120' cell tower is likely to attract  
214 residential developers. He noted that the applicant initiated the process with a smaller lease area and a  
215 desire to erect a monopole or lattice tower. There is a chance the Board's requirements could make it  
216 impossible for the project to proceed. If this were to happen, the service needs of the community would not  
217 be met. He asked the applicant to provide information about the economic impact of expanding the lease  
218 area and installing a more aesthetically pleasing tower. The Board will need to determine whether or not it  
219 should consider a less visually attractive alternative.

220  
221 Mr. Walters stated that expanding the lease area and erecting a monopine will significantly drive up the  
222 cost and has the potential to make a project cost prohibitive. The cost of erecting a monopine tower is  
223 something that the applicant will need to consider. In some instances the type of tower has clearly been the  
224 differential for other facilities. The applicant believes a monopole or lattice tower would be appropriate for  
225 this location. A monopine is going to be clearly visible from greater distances.

226  
227 Mr. Smolinsky stated that he is in favor of the monopine because it improves the visual appearance of the  
228 tower. There are many forests all over NYS which contain deciduous and coniferous trees. The  
229 surrounding properties are zoned residential and he thinks the monopine is most compatible. If the  
230 economics are part of the decision making process the Board would need more information. He does not  
231 have a fear of adding to the cost of the project because he is more concerned about the residential area  
232 surrounding the project and high traffic approaches to the site. Mr. Behuniak prefers the monopine. He  
233 noted that the applicant did not mention economic concerns with the monopine when presenting the  
234 project. The applicant did, however, mention the type of trees that would surround the tower and the  
235 additional height that would be needed to simulate the appearance of a pine tree. He also stated that he  
236 would like to make sure staff is planning to follow up on the Board's previous request to inform  
237 neighboring Towns about the proposed cell tower project. Mr. Rice stated that if it is the Board's intent to  
238 try and provide a benefit to the rural landowner, it makes sense to move forward. He prefers the

239 installation of a monopine and would need to see supporting documentation if it makes the project  
240 economically infeasible. Ms. Powers concurred and stated that her second choice would be the monopole.  
241 Mr. Coffey stated that he agrees with Mr. Smolinsky's comments regarding the aesthetics of the monopine.  
242 He questioned why the applicant did not mention the economics.  
243

244 Mr. Walters stated that he did not mention economics in his presentation because most Board's are usually  
245 concerned with visual impacts and do not take the applicant's money matters into consideration. The  
246 benefit to constructing a lattice tower is that light passes through it. A monopole is slightly more expensive  
247 but it can be erected in one day. A monopine tower could be as much as 10 to 15 times more expensive.  
248 At the end of the day, the applicant wants to provide a service and build a tower on the Preska farm. If the  
249 Board decides to require a monopine, the ability to do that would be directly contingent on the lease  
250 agreement with Verizon and AT & T. It is a discussion that the applicants will need to have with the  
251 carriers.  
252

253 Chairman Leveille stated that he is focused on the service needs of the community. The project is already  
254 in an area where utility poles interfere with the landscape. He does not believe the location commands the  
255 installation of a monopine and is reasonably satisfied that a monopole would be an appropriate solution.  
256 He does not want the cost of the project to be prohibitive and would like the applicant to provide the Board  
257 with a cost comparison. He is sensitive to the fact that the Town is committed to finding economic value in  
258 rural land. The expanded lease area will help to ensure that the installation will blend into the natural  
259 environment. He would like the tower to resemble a tree but it is in fact, a pole designed to look like a tree.  
260 It was noted that the majority of members preferred the ESCO site and a monopine tower. The Board does  
261 not have a problem with the change in height with regard to SEQR review and they looked favorably upon  
262 expanding the lease area. He suggested that staff prepare the SEQR documentation with the expanded  
263 lease area and the monopine with feedback from the developer related to economic issues that may affect  
264 that decision.  
265

266 Mr. Silliman noted that it is likely that the Planning Board will be asked to take action on a SEQR Negative  
267 Declaration at the September 7, 2010 meeting. Once the Planning Board acts on the SEQR, the matter  
268 would be taken up by the ZBA at the September 15, 2010 meeting. It is likely that the ZBA will act on the  
269 variance application and determine the appropriate height of the structure. If the Negative Declaration  
270 indicates that the Board's preference is a monopine, the ZBA would determine the minimum height  
271 necessary which is acceptable because an increase in height could be used for mitigation purposes. If the  
272 ZBA acts on the variance application the Planning Board could hold a Public Hearing for the Special Use  
273 Application on September 21, 2010.  
274

275 Upon motion of Mr. Behuniak, seconded by Mr. Smolinsky, and approved by all voting Members present,  
276 further discussion of the ESCO Tower project was tabled. Ms. Motta abstained.  
277

#### 278 **Verstandig's, 454 Delaware Avenue, Delmar, NY (Site Plan Amendment)**

279 Michael Tucker of Infinigy Engineering, Scott Wallant, Architect, Louie Lecce, Attorney, and Stephen  
280 Bolduc, applicant, were present to provide information and answer questions. Mr. Bolduc stated that he is  
281 requesting an amendment to the approved site plan to allow for construction of 13 townhomes with 27 units  
282 instead of nine condominiums with 40 units. There will be two unit townhomes and three unit townhomes.  
283 The size of each townhomes will be roughly 2,188 square feet and each will have a two car garage and a  
284 first floor master suite. The townhomes are very similar in design to the condominiums except that there  
285 will be no residences under/over the other. The buildings will be craftsman style and there will be a  
286 community feel within the project.  
287

288 The project is located in a Multi-Family "MR" zoning district. The stormwater management plan,  
289 proposed utilities, ingress/egress, internal road layout, setbacks, impervious surface, and green space, will  
290 remain unchanged. The SWPPP will need to be updated. No phasing is proposed. The applicant will be  
291 able to construct a model townhome. The cost will be in the \$400,000+ range. Ownership of the  
292 townhouse units will be consistent with the ownership of the approved condominium units. An individual

293 who purchases the townhome will own the unit and the foundation beneath it. Each unit will be conveyed  
294 with an interest in the homeowner's association lands. The Homeowners Association will own and maintain  
295 the lawns, landscaping, driveways, sidewalks and the exteriors of all of the buildings. A utility building  
296 will remain in the plan.

297  
298 The condominium project was originally granted Site Plan Approval (153) on March 17, 2009. An  
299 Amendment (153 A1) was granted on May 19, 2009 to reduce the footprint of one of the buildings, modify  
300 a storage building, and change the size of a utility/storage building. A 90 day extension was granted for the  
301 approved site plan on April 20, 2010. The townhome project is expected to go before the Development  
302 Planning Committee on August 19, 2010 and a formal application will need to be submitted to the Planning  
303 Board. The townhome project is a site plan amendment. The project does not require subdivision approval  
304 because individual lots are not being created. The Town Code describes Townhouse units as multifamily  
305 dwellings. The deed conveying the townhouse would describe the unit on the site plan map and as built  
306 maps that are filed with the County Clerk. The map filing information would also be provided to the  
307 assessor for the tax identification purposes.

308 Mr. Luce stated the reason for the change in use was because the applicant would have had to construct  
309 the entire project before the first condo could be sold. The applicant was unable to build a model  
310 condominium or construct the project in phases. Furthermore, the condominiums were more costly to build  
311 because the design required the installation of elevators and sprinkler systems and the applicant would have  
312 had to pay \$10,000-\$12,000 per building for the offering plan.

313  
314 The Board received a letter from the applicant, dated August 2, 2010 requesting an additional ninety (90) day  
315 extension to the site plan approval, extending the start time of construction to November 19, 2010.

316  
317 Upon motion of Mr. Rice, seconded by Mr. Smolinsky, and approved by all Members present, the Board  
318 voted to grant a 90 day extension on the approved site plan.

319  
320 Upon motion of Mr. Smolinsky, seconded by Mr. Behuniak, and approved by all Members present, the Board  
321 voted to table further discussion of the Verstandig's Townhome project.

322  
323 **Minutes**

324 Upon motion by Mr. Smolinsky, seconded by Mr. Coffey, the Members voted to approve the June 1, 2010  
325 minutes, as amended. Ms. Powers abstained because she was not present for the June 1st meeting.

326  
327 Upon motion by Mr. Rice, seconded by Mr. Smolinsky, the Members voted to approve the June 15, 2010  
328 minutes, as written.

329  
330 Upon motion by Ms. Powers, seconded by Ms. Motta, the Members voted to approve the July 6, 2010  
331 minutes, as written. Mr. Coffey abstained because he was not present for the July 6th meeting.

332  
333 Upon motion by Mr. Behuniak, seconded by Mr. Coffey, the Members voted to approve the July 20, 2010  
334 minutes, as written. Mr. Leveille, Ms. Motta and Ms. Powers abstained because they were not present for  
335 the July 20th meeting.

336  
337 **Meeting Schedule**

338 Tuesday, September 7, 2010, at 6:00 p.m. – Regular Meeting & Public Hearing for South Albany Airport  
339 Tuesday, September 21, 2010, at 6:00 p.m. – Regular Meeting

340  
341 Respectfully submitted,  
342 Deborah Kitchen