

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

August 27, 2013

REGULAR MEETING

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by Tonya Yasenchak at 7:01 p.m. On roll call, the following members are present: Tonya Yasenchak, Nathan Duffney, Michael Gyarmathy, Andrew McKnight, Thomas Siragusa, John Streit, and Stan Weeks. John Bokus, Alternate, is absent. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer, is present. Mike Hill, representing the Town Attorney's office, is also present.

MINUTES – August 13, 2013

MOTION: T. Siragusa

SECOND: S. Weeks

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of August 12, 2013 with minor corrections.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Gyarmathy, McKnight, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak
Noes: None

PLANNING BOARD CASES

MARK YOUNG – Minor Subdivision

Plank Road

Mark Young is present. T. Yasenchak reviews that the applicant was here previously with a concept plan and now has surveyed plans. M. Young states that he is very happy with the outcome of the plans; all lots meet zoning and explains the reason for the configuration. C. Baker states that this is straightforward and everything required is on the plans. Public hearing is discussed. J. Streit feels that since the lots are in excessive of zoning, we would not necessarily have to have a public meeting. B. Duffney states that the lot sizes are all above and beyond requirements. Board consensus is to hold a public hearing and one is set for September 10, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.

BALLSTON MOURNINGKILL ASSOCIATES LLC – Site Plan Review

NYS Route 9 (Maple Avenue)

Eric Carlson is present, he provides the Board with a drawing and states that he was granted ZBA area variances. He has moved the driveway to the right side as that made more sense with the Town's buffers. He is moving the office building back so that it is within the correct setbacks. Regarding the number of parking spaces, E. Carlson states that his engineer has used some formulas that are used for shared spacing. There are studies to show that when people are home at the apartments, the office building is out and vice versa. He looked up some of these formulas and using a one-bedroom apartment, the standard is 1.25 parking spots. For a shared office he came up with 20 spaces required. Using the shared parking factor that was provided by some studies done in Pennsylvania, it came out with 16 spots. He is proposing 24. He states that if he went directly by the Town's regs, it would be 2 spots per apartment, which would be 16, and one for 300 square foot of commercial space would be 17, for a total of 33 spots. T. Yasenchak encourages

August 27, 2013

the applicant to read the Town's regulations about parking because it is pretty specific. It also says how the Planning Board may waive parking. If the Board were to waive it, he still has to show how it can fit on the lot, so that if at some time that is required. E. Carlson states that those were the only changes he made from the last meeting and he is just really looking for a nod to go on to engineering. T. Yasenchak states that there are a lot of things that, without the engineering being done, we can't be very specific with our comments. E. Carlson states that his intent is if the Board is ok with the concept. If not, he does not want to move forward with paying for engineering. T. Siragusa states that he does not think that he has any additional questions. He saw that the applicant switched sides for the driveway. In general, he thinks it looks crowded on paper, but it would be conceptually an improvement to the space and it fits in the area. He does not have any conceptual objections. E. Carlson states that the ZBA did discuss the neighborhood and what is on that street. He feels that he has provided quite a bit of green space here. The building footprints are very small. S. Weeks states that the applicant has improved it some by having some green space on both sides, some buffering. B. Duffney questions the infiltration system for the 8 units. How big is the system, how long will it last with 8 units. E. Carlson states that his engineer will provide it to current NYS standards. The system that they have been using has been very effective. It is a little bit new to New York, but it is not new to the country. It is a pre-treatment sewer system where the outflow from the system is almost brought down to something that you can dump in a stream. In fact, the system that he is purchasing has done exactly that in the Federal streams of Gore Mountain and that area. He states that they are discharging it subsurface, just like a septic system. The only difference is that they can treat it more like storm water as opposed to a spread out septic system. There is a cost to this system, but the advantage is that it can be treated more like storm water. B. Duffney asks if perk tests have been done. E. Carlson states that they are planning to do those this week. B. Duffney asks about the water. With 8 apartment units plus the office space he believes that will use some pretty serious water. E. Carlson states that they did a study on the last project that they did; it was 54 apartment units. In the last 10 – 12 years he has built over 2000 apartments and a lot of those were metered so they were able to get the usage rates. It turns out that apartments average about 45 gallons per bedroom per day. That is a number they shared with the Health Department and State DEC. The 54 apartments were designed around those figures and have been working for 2 years. B. Duffney asks if they are going to have a water storage facility. E. Carlson states that they will not. They will have UV or chlorination. The well will meet public water designation. A. McKnight states that he has no objections to the proposal, we are just going to expect that the applicant is meeting the letter of our zoning law. J. Streit questions that the apartments will be 4 over 4, and that they are all accessible from the parking lot area. E. Carlson states that is correct. M. Gyarmathy asks about the width of the driveway. E. Carlson states that it will be whatever is required. C. Baker states that this is a very aggressive concept, we need to see the engineering before he can comment. When we receive the details, there may be changes. T. Yasenchak reiterates that the applicant should look at the regulations of what we require on a site plan. She states that the Board would like to see where the adjacent buildings are along with wells and septic. She states that trash removal and loading areas are also required to be on the plans. She questions that the sidewalk will be ADA accessible in the front and back. E. Carlson states that this is a very flat site so there is no reason why he can't make both entrances ADA. T. Yasenchak states that the Board will also want to see signage and site lighting.

RON MOREHOUSE – Minor Subdivision
NYS Route 9N and Canty Road

Ron Morehouse is not present. David Barass, Land Surveyor, is present for the applicant. D. Barass states that the applicant would like to subdivide this 7-acre parcel into 4 lots. On lot 2 there is an existing mobile home, the other three lots are vacant and the applicant intends to build his home on lot 3. The lots do meet the zoning requirements. The applicant has done a substantial amount of grading work. A. McKnight comments on a marking on the plans. D. Barass explains that the boundary is actually the center of the stream. A. McKnight states that it is hard to believe that there would be no wetlands on the property. D. Barass states that there is a steep embankment down to the stream. The building setback line is at about the

August 27, 2013

top of that embankment. He states that there are no DEC mapped wetlands. C. Baker states that typically what we have done in the past with lots that adjoin a stream corridor is ask for the edge of the wetlands to be delineated, along the developed side of the stream. He states that on lot 4, the house is too close to the stream, it appears to be within 100' of the stream, so that would require a DEC permit. J. Streit questions the sight distance for the driveway location of lot #4. D. Barass states that was a concern of theirs also. He states that is an unposted road; it is a 90-degree turn there. It is posted at a suggested speed of 15 mph. The applicant has located the driveway to maximize the sight distance; he has removed a lot of dirt there and improved that corner. They did take sight distance measurements, got 410-feet up Canty Road and you can see all the way back to the Route 9N intersection in the other direction. They are never going to be able to get any more. D. Barass thinks that ASHTO at 55 mph is 700-feet. T. Siragusa questions the topo lines. D. Barass states that R. Morehouse is still in the process of removing dirt there. He finished the excavation at the road before they took the sight distance. This is the maximum they can get because as you go beyond the 410-feet you are at the crest of a hill. T. Yasenchak states that we will need to see something in writing about that, or if there is any other location that that driveway can be. D. Barass states that if the applicant is going to put in the fourth lot, he is going to need some type of relief from the sight distance requirement. He states that they were hoping that the practicality of the 90-degree bend there, that traffic has to slow down to go around the corner. T. Yasenchak states that typically the Planning Board is not the ones who give that relief because the Board is not the licensed engineers. We typically request that an engineer look at that and certify the compliance of the driveway so we are not putting the Town in a bad situation of approving a driveway that does not meet the regulations. M. Gyarmathy states that his two questions have been answered. He does have a concern about the house location on lot 4 in relation to the stream. T. Siragusa questions that there is a notation that says electrical panel. He asks if that means it has been developed. D. Barass states that the applicant had electrical service put in. He is has a camp trailer set up there that he is using as a site office. T. Siragusa questions the shared driveway and that they plan to keep it. D. Barass states that there used to be a mobile home on each of those lots and one was removed. It was a shared driveway originally. Rather than create a new curb cut there and have two close together, which is not a good situation, they put the driveways in using the same curb cut. The driveways, once they cross the State right-of-way line, would be on their own properties. It is really just a shared curb cut. T. Siragusa states that he saw the mobile homes on the satellite photo. He asks how there were two mobile homes on the property if there weren't two lots. D. Barass states that it was pre-existing. T. Yasenchak asks if the existing mobile home is staying. D. Barass states that is the plan. C. Baker states that if this does move forward, it does need to go to the NYS DOT. T. Yasenchak states that her questions were regarding the sight distance, especially at the one driveway; the existing mobile home is staying with its well and septic; she asks about the well and septic on the lot of the mobile home that was removed. D. Barass states that they were sharing a well. T. Yasenchak states that the Board is concerned about lot 4, it seems to be a very tight lot. We do need to see that delineated so that we know how close the house can be on each of the lots, maybe some topo as well. We will need to see something more in writing about the sight distance. We have in the past not approved plans if they did not have adequate sight distance. We will send out lead agency letters. C. Baker suggests waiting until we have the delineation before sending out those letters.

CASEY CORNELL – Major Subdivision

Humes Road

Casey Cornell and Gary Robinson are present for the application. A. McKnight recuses himself. G. Robinson reviews that Casey Cornell purchased 95 acres on Humes Road, in the LDR zone, 6-acre minimum. The applicant would like to subdivide the property into 13 lots, meeting all zoning regulations. They have done test pits and perc tests, all of which were good for on site septic systems. They will be working with the Highway Department regarding storm water as related to the road. The access to Coy Road has been changed to 90-degrees and extended the right-of-way to 60-feet. They are planning to use roadside drainage ditches and there will be an infiltration basin at the corner of Coy and Humes roads. T. Yasenchak asks if there were any additional adjustments made to the plans based on the previous comments from the

August 27, 2013

Board. G. Robinson states that they did. One of the issues was the easement to the land locked parcel to the west. There is no final decision on that yet. The Board had stated that they would rather have the easement on one side of the property line instead of down the middle. They have done that. They are still unsure, there has been some interest by the adjacent property owner in the property. If that does not come to fruition, they may still put an easement there. If it does come to fruition, it would be changed to a lot line adjustment. Regarding the easement from the end of Humes to the former Ridge Road. He has spoken to the surveyor who has researched that. The surveyor has found no easement there or right for passage for anyone. The plan is to leave that there as it is, in case someone does come up with something, they want to leave it as it is so that it could be used. G. Robinson states that they are not showing an easement on the plans, it is a trail that is shown. If someone were to come forward, they would have to prove that they had a right to use that. Another thing that was discussed was the pond at lots 4 and 5, which is fed from the end of the pipeline coming across lot 4. The pond is partially on each lot. The Board's comments were that they would like to see it all on the same lot. They did take a look at it and they don't think that there is a way to get that to happen. What they are thinking about doing is filling in the pond. They had moved the road right-of-way to stay out of the pond and then they would not have to worry about that. They would then not have to worry about the pipe and whose property it is on. They are trying to get a hold of the right people to talk to, as there are some wetlands on the property. The only reason this pond has water in it is because of the pipeline coming down. Once they get rid of that pipeline, this is going to dry up. T. Siragusa asks if they would remove the pipe. G. Robinson states they would abandon the pipe. Right now at some locations you can actually see the pipe above ground and it is not in very good shape. If for some reason they cannot fill in the pond, then they would propose an easement on the pipeline because both properties actually have access to the pond. It would be kind of like a common driveway easement.

A public hearing is opened at 7:50 p.m. Marianne Pompa LaRoche representing Pompa Bros., a major adjoining landowner to this parcel. She states that some of her comments are going back to about 10 years ago when they came before the Board; they had many citizens against them. The Town created the Kayaderosseras Ridge zone, which created 8-acre zoning. It put a lot of restrictions on her property. There is not much they can do with it other than pay school and property taxes and let other people enjoy it, unless they donate it to a land conservancy. She states that she is for this project, because of all that they went through. She understands that C. Cornell has been in the community for a long time, his business has developed, he has been able to invest in this property and make a profit on it. She thinks that is good with the right precautions that the Board is taking. With that being said, and with the recent event of some illegal blasting on State Park land, and all the complaints we have had in the area for that, she states that this is a 95-acre parcel, 6-acre lots, looking at 13 or 15 lots. That is thirty plus people, thirty plus vehicles, thirty plus people who can buy on Sunday and come in to the Town on Monday and complain about the existing businesses in the neighborhood. The two quarries and the tri-town pit have been in existence since pre-1960, pre-zoning. They all try to be a good resident; a good community citizen and they want to try to maintain that. She is going to petition the Planning Board once again, she tried many years ago and Malta has done this with the speedway, Milton has done it with the air port – she would like to see the Board strongly consider having the developer put deed language into the deeds. There are two quarries, less than 5 miles away, there is truck traffic, there is blasting, dust – all these things that everyone complained about. These are all things that people can come back to the Board and complain about if it is not put in. The Town trucks go right past Humes Road to get to their pit. She would like to see the Board consider that. She does not want to make the comparison about C. Cornell's application, but when they were approached about increased traffic, it came up that if they were approved, they would have to re-do Coy Road. In what she has read, it looks like the Town might pick up part of the cost of this. She is wondering if Humes is going to continue further than it already is, if the Town/tax payers are going to pay to have Humes fixed to come out at the right angle or typically that goes back to the developer and the homebuyers pick up that tab. She was curious as to the roadway, the length and width; the curbs; sidewalks; catch basins; signage; street lighting – is any of that going to be added onto Humes Road at the Town's expense or how do you divide that up. She states that she did not have a chance to check her deed to find out about the easement. She believes that they go in off of Ridge Road, but they do border the property at the back end where the trail goes up. It is a notable access

August 27, 2013

road to the graphite mines, which are on her property, which has been an on-going problem. They are still looking at options of what they can do with the graphite mines – but there are parties, people dumping their household garbage there, etc. She is hoping that this might curtail it, if houses there might stop that. The Peacock Brook was a big issue with them and she did not know how close it will be to homes, lawn chemicals, etc. She heard that there is a storm water plan so she is assuming that that is taking a look at all that. Aside from that, they do not have an issue with the subdivision, but she would like those things looked at.

Peter Simoneau, Peckham Industries, states he has the same concerns as M. LaRoche. He states that Peckham Industries are the operators of a neighboring quarry and gravel pit on Coy Road. Greenfield is one of the few towns in NYS that went out of its way to legally encourage and welcome mineral extraction. Accepting that there will always be the effects of noise, dust, truck traffic, blasting and all the other things that M. LaRoche said, mineral extraction was included as a land use by Greenfield. As a defender of property rights, he fully understands C. Cornell's intentions with this land, however he strongly encourages the Planning Board to carefully consider the ramifications of a major subdivision next to the mineral extraction district. By standing by, we unwittingly allow ourselves to be subjected to becoming surrounded by neighbors that ultimately might fight all the things that we currently do legally everyday. As M. LaRoche mentioned, it has been their unfortunate experience that people buy homes on Sundays and move in on the days that they blast. There being no further public comment, this public hearing is adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

T. Yasenchak states that she is leaving the public hearing open because there is more information forthcoming. She states that we have required applicants in the past who have been near farms to put that deed language in so that people are aware that they are buying near a farm and that that comes with certain issues. She thinks that having the applicant put something in about the blasting and mineral extraction is fair, it allows anyone who is buying it to be fully apprised of the situation ahead of time. The Board concurs. G. Robinson asks if it needs to be in the deeds or can it go on the final map. He states that they have done something like that in the Town of Moreau. R. Rowland states that she believes in the other case it was to be put on the final plat, not necessarily in the deeds. M. Hill states that a note added to the map, and also added to the deeds, but on the map is a very effective way to put people on notice and it becomes a matter of record when the plat is filed. Both seem to be a good idea. J. Streit suggests putting it in both places because then it is covered in case they don't read one or the other. M. Hill states that typically when people purchase real estate, the fact that a note is on a map and the map is a matter of public record, that puts a buyer on notice, so to speak. To the point that they may not read the deed, then the map will give them that notice. He thinks that J. Streit's point is well taken, putting it in both places provides an extra assurance that one way or the other potential buyers should be alerted to the presence of the mining/mineral extraction. J. Streit states that it would be in the best interest of both parties – the existing quarries and the new property owners. G. Robinson asks if the Board has some language for that or would they like him to propose something? T. Yasenchak suggests proposing some language and looking into what the Town has required of other applicants who are near farms, that might give them a good starting point. T. Siragusa suggests maybe asking the neighbors who made the recommendation; maybe they would help with language as we are looking to protect them as well. B. Duffney comments that with the deed language, what about some over zealous realtor who might not let people know that there is mining. He thinks that would be another reason for the deed and the map. T. Yasenchak states that we do have the long form SEQRA, however we really should wait for the information on what is going to happen with the pond, the roadway, etc. C. Baker states that he is working on the detailed review. C. Cornell asks if they put the language on the deeds and the map, what if one of the mines wants to get three times bigger? What you are saying is that all these people have signed off and have no say in the mine tripling their size. T. Yasenchak states no, everyone has property rights. If at some point an adjacent property owner, no matter who they are or what they do on their property, wants to come in and increase their use or do something, and it is the same as if a neighbor wants to subdivide, all the neighbors, just because they purchase property and understand that there is a mine nearby or whatever, they still have the right to speak at a public hearing. Any increased use or any subdivision or different land use that needs to come before this Planning Board, will still go through the proper process. If

August 27, 2013

someone buys property that has that language, they are just accepting the fact that they know that it is in the vicinity. M. Hill states that any future property owner would still have the right to come in and comment on any proposed expansion of a mining use. They are not waiving their rights to come in and comment about it. The purpose of the language is just to put any prospective buyer on notice that there are mining operations nearby and they should anticipate potential noise from blasting, truck traffic, etc.

PRESTWICK CHASE – PUD Amendment

Denton Road

Fred McNeary, Jr., and Luigi Palleschi, ABD Engineers, are present. L. Palleschi states that this property consists of an existing PUD, which they would like to amend from the existing 89-acre PUD to encompass the entire 116 acres. They currently have a 164 unit senior building with an existing boulevard entrance with parking; there are 6 existing cottages on the site. They are proposing to extend the road, the location of the entrance off of Daniels where it meets the required intersection sight distance. They are proposing 297 senior apartments, a mixture of 2- and 3-story units throughout the site. There is existing sanitary sewer and wells, which are sufficient to accommodate this proposed plan. Storm water will meet the DEC requirements, the green infrastructure, and the latest regulations. They are proposing 2 storm water ponds. T. Yasenchak questions that L. Palleschi stated 297 apartments and that they had previously stated 293. L. Palleschi states that 293 is correct, they had originally proposed 300 but had to eliminate 1 seven unit building. T. Yasenchak reviews the Planning Board process.

A public hearing is opened at 8:14 p.m. Rosemary Jensen, Locust Grove Road, states that she is the co-owner of property that is directly impacted and they currently operate a certified green Bed and Breakfast, certified by Audubon, and they work really hard to keep the land natural. To have 3-story buildings being built adjacent to their property, she thinks will have a very detrimental effect. Prestwick Chase is a great neighbor and a lot of her friends live there, but 3-stories in a country, residential area she thinks is too much. She would like to request that that be reconsidered because it is going to look like apartment buildings out there, something not very rural. Her other concern is that there are a lot of wetlands in there and the water table is very high. She knows because they have had their water tested in the backfield, very close to where Prestwick Chase is. She is very concerned about the impact of below ground, what this is going to do.

Hayim Schwartzman, Daniels Road, states that he also objects to 3-story buildings stating that it would dramatically change the nature of the homes and buildings in that area. It would be a big step for a zoning change in that area; it would change the complexion of the neighborhood. His biggest concern is Daniels Road, which is presently, in his opinion, inadequately planned for the current traffic that exists there. The speed limit is pretty high there at 45 mph and there has been a dramatic increase in pedestrian and bicycle traffic, especially because of the new dormitory that Skidmore built. It has increased the number of students on campus and that is a frequently used location. The road there has many curves and undulations, and he frequently hears cars screeching to a halt to avoid accidents in that area. Here we are proposing to add an access to that area, roadway access, with many housing units and people going into that area. He thinks that the Town needs to reconsider how that whole roadway, pedestrian and bicycle traffic is routed in that area. In addition, Prestwick Chase has aggressively posted their property and prevented access to their property, so if there was a solution other than increasing to provide adequate shoulders for the roadway for pedestrians, an alternate solution could be some kind of dual use of the land around where Prestwick Chase is located to allow pedestrian/bicycle traffic an alternate route instead of the roadway. He thinks that some thought needs to be given to protecting the people in that area.

Bob Hyndman, Denton Road, indicates his property line on the plans and states that they moved there about 11 years ago. Even prior to his buying his property, Prestwick Chase has been a very good neighbor, always involved with what is going on. His history with Prestwick Chase is that every time that we have an election in Greenfield or Saratoga County, everyone makes tracks to speak at Prestwick Chase.

August 27, 2013

With this addition, Prestwick Chase will have close to 1/10th of the Town population living on 100 acres off of Denton Road. This is what this part of Greenfield was zoned for, the higher density development for the community. It is going to support the tax base, he thinks dramatically. This affects every resident in Greenfield in trying to keep our taxes in check. He thinks that doubling the size only benefits the community. Right now we are going through this whole thing with the ambulance committee within Greenfield, we don't really have enough calls in Greenfield to justify an ambulance service. A third of the current 300 calls are Prestwick Chase. The closer we get to 600 the best the per person price is. With Prestwick doubling in size, it is going to put us to over 400 calls probably, which will help all the other residents in the community in getting the ambulance service they desire. The Prestwick Chase residents have become part of the character of the neighborhood. He understands the issues with Daniels Road and states that Denton has been a drag strip and the improvement the Town made to the road, which was wonderful, but now the bikes are back, hot rods are back, etc. and it's a beautiful drag strip again. They have talked to developers about putting in a lane for bicycles before and for pedestrians. He states that the people who live there, their children have worked at Prestwick Chase. He indicates on the map where, when he hadn't been there a year and Prestwick Chase came and planted white pines along the border of his property. He now has a very mature screen and almost don't know that Prestwick Chase is there. Just last week, unsolicited, Prestwick has offered to come back and reinforce the planting. He states that when he moved out here from Saratoga he was told not to expect this area to look like this forever. Prestwick was already there; they were talking about the other side of the road. It hasn't happened yet, he supposes some day it will. He moved to this area knowing that he wasn't moving to a farm. This is exactly the smart type of development that he thinks we need in Greenfield. We are a residential community, this type of density. He strongly supported denser zoning for this area because it makes sense with the sewer and water that is available in the area. He thinks it is here and it is kind of a no brainer to let it go, and he supports the development.

Peter Goutos, Denton Road, states that he is not here to oppose this development but there are some things that he thinks we can do, and F. McNeary will do, given the opportunity to promote the rural aspect of what we have in southern Greenfield, as well as to protect some view sheds and address some traffic issues that we have long since wanted to continue to address. Primarily what we have is a lot of development going on and a lot of different things coming across the Planning Board and the Town Board. This in particular is ironically not as dense as what was initially proposed when Prestwick Chase was given the PUD. The layout however is such that it is going to affect some of the neighbors and he is one of them. Opportunities exist to cite and provide screening and to address and mitigate much of the physical impacts of this project. He states that he has already talked with F. McNeary about an opportunity to meet with him to look over the plans and walk the site to see how we can address an area which they have a shared interest in with the Bed and Breakfast as well as his residence and the Bouchard's next door. He states that Denton Road has become a freeway in a lot of cases. It is a pass through and the new road improvements, they applaud because they did need that, but Denton Road is also a walkway and a bikeway. There are countless people from F. McNeary's development along with residents of the area, bikers from Saratoga and elsewhere who use Denton Road and there are opportunities with all the things we are doing to try to mitigate what has turned into a pretty significant hazard for some of the folks who want to use it in a non-car or motorcycle mode. As we look at the development and consider the traffic aspects, which probably will not be as large as you might consider given the population and the over-55 use of the facility. We have an opportunity to make some improvements on Denton and further address the hazards that we have on Daniels Road. An easy one is speed limits.

Paul Bouchard, Denton Road, questions which units are 3-story and which are 2-story on the plans. He would like to reinforce the conditions on Denton Road for pedestrians and cars. He states that he is surprised that we have not had a head-on collision there just because the road is too narrow for anything aside or in addition to cars.

Thomas Paton, Country Squire Court, states that he is trying to understand where this is coming out on to Daniels Road. He states that he has lived there for 18 years, he has 3 teenage boys, two of whom drive

August 27, 2013

and every time they leave the house he fears for them pulling out of the development. When they moved in 18 years ago Daniels Road was a two-lane country road. People used to ride horses down the road. He and his wife would walk up Daniels to Braim and then Granite Lake Drive. They haven't done that for years because of the dangers. The truck traffic, which is illegal on Daniels Road, continues. Town highway trucks from Wilton, South Glens Falls – why they are allowed on the road, he does not know. Today there was a tractor-trailer from Wilton town highway on the road. Why the Town of Greenfield Highway Superintendent allows that to continue, that is something he wishes the Board would look into. Motorcycles, going from the 4-way stop at Locust Grove Road, by the time they get to Country Squire they are probably doing 65-70 mph at least. He is afraid that someone, one of this neighbors or one of his sons, is going to get t-boned one morning pulling out of that development and we are going to have a fatal right there. The traffic is horrendous on Daniels Road, it should not be 45 mph, it is a residential area and it should be lowered to 30 mph. He states that he cannot conceive having another road come out onto Daniels Road in that area especially in the S-turns. You can sit there and watch the number of people who do not obey the double yellow lines in the S-turns and go through the middle of the roadway. He has almost been hit several times going through there in the last 18 years. It is a dangerous area, he does not argue the fact that F. McNeary should be allowed to advance his property and sell more units; his concern is Daniels Road and the traffic that is going to be impacted also by the residents. The new residents who will move into that complex are going to have to deal with the challenges of getting out onto Daniels Road at that area. It is not a good area to put an avenue into Prestwick Chase. T. Paton asks the Board to reconsider that. F. McNeary asks T. Paton to give the Board his background. T. Paton states that he is a Station Commander with the New York State Police. He has been with the NYS Police for 26 years so he is very familiar with traffic and it's impacts. He has patrolled Daniels Road since 1994.

Susan Celia, Braim Road, states that she lives just the other side of the S-turns. She walks, runs and bikes Daniels, Locust, Denton, Bloomfield and Clinton almost every day. She could probably provide a traffic study. She thinks that Daniels Road traffic has tripled in the last three years. There have been 3 evenings around 2 a.m. this summer when she has heard terrible screeching through the S-turns, bracing for someone to go into the deep ravine and be killed. It is a very dangerous S-turn, no one is obeying the speed limit; they are doing at least 60 mph; they come through the S-turn about 45 where it is marked 25, and 60 where it is marked 45. She used to see great masses of bicyclists coming out Daniels and going up Braim, she liked that. She is not seeing those bicyclists anymore. She states that there are tag-teams of motorcyclists down both lanes, catching air. She did speak at a meeting a couple of months ago about the traffic on Daniels. Today the Town of Wilton paving trucks every 5 minutes. She thinks we need to examine Daniels Road traffic further. She has no objection to this project; he is utilizing the zoning the way she thinks it should be. She is concerned about the entrance onto Daniels Road. Perhaps a cul-de-sac or double entrance onto Denton. She states that she has noticed that when the seniors do pull out onto Denton, they are really sweet and they take their time accelerating, get their wits about them and off they go. They will not have that opportunity on Daniels Road.

Les Lawrence, Country Squire, states that he fully supports F. McNeary's project and is just concerned as a person who has been hit twice on Daniels, right out of the S-turns. His car was totaled last year. Someone has to take a look at that. It is not a safe place to get in and out. They cannot get in and out of their development, and we are going to add another entrance there? It is dangerous, when you come out in the morning, you cross your fingers and hope you get out alive because people are up to 55 mph easily. It is not safe, he asks that that be taken into consideration, but he is fully supportive of the project. Can we put extra stop signs in there, a traffic light? He does not want to create problems, he asks if there is a way so the 18 year old kids can't get up to 60 around the S-curve. Is there a way to prevent that? Is there a way to give the seniors safe entrance onto Daniels – a traffic light? How can we make it safe? He states that he has been through 2 cars, he doesn't want to go through a third one and he doesn't want the seniors doing that either.

Mary Ellen Angi, Daniels Road, states that she would like to echo her neighbors. She lives 4 houses from the S-curves and cannot back out of her driveway; she can only go out forward because they are coming

August 27, 2013

so fast from both sides. She agrees that something needs to be done, especially if you are going to try to put a road out there. Someone will get hurt.

There being no further public comments, this public hearing is adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

F. McNeary states that he would like to make an offer to anyone who has issues with screening, with anything with this project, he is open to the public. He has met with some of the neighbors. If anyone would like to meet, whether it is regarding traffic, and he lives on Daniels Road and agrees with the neighbor's comments. He reiterates that anyone can come and see him; he can be reached any day at Prestwick. T. Yasenchak states that she has a concern that the 3-story buildings were the ones closest to the houses that people would see as well as be seen from the road. We do have a height limitation within the district, 35-feet, and the applicant did say that the height would be below that, however, is there any other location for the 3-story buildings. She states that if the 3-story buildings are in the front of the property, it is more of a visual impact than if they are 2-story. F. McNeary explains that the reason he put a cluster of 2-story and a cluster of 3-story buildings in the front was for marketing purposes so that they could complete them and have them available for prospective residents to see. He got the feeling where this is going with the Board and the public. He states that it isn't a problem to switch locations. L. Palleschi agrees. T. Yasenchak reiterates that that would lessen the visual impact from the road. We are also talking about a residential neighborhood and not changing the character of that neighborhood, a 3-story is more apartment like, feeling a little more like commercial. Regarding Daniels Road, T. Yasenchak states that we do have a traffic report on that. She asks C. Baker if he has looked at the traffic report. C. Baker states that he has not done a thorough review yet. L. Palleschi states that a traffic study was done in 1996 and at that time there were no impacts. Traffic study was updated this year, no impacts of the proposed development compared to the existing approval of the PUD. There was actually a reduction of 25% cars from the 1996 study to the study done this year. T. Yasenchak clarifies that is for the proposed traffic for the proposed PUD amendment. T. Yasenchak asks if L. Palleschi can speak to how the traffic has changed on that road. L. Palleschi states that it is in the report. F. McNeary states that from 1996 when they originally were approved, Saratoga has grown tremendously, parts of Wilton, Greenfield and Milton have also grown tremendously. Daniels and Denton roads have become cut-throughs instead of going through the city of Saratoga Springs. He does not believe that the middle school was up and running at that time. He states that they have a considerable amount of bus traffic and it depends on the day and what time they are going through which road they use. Now that the train is running back to North Creek, you can catch the train and they do have to come to a complete stop before crossing the railroad tracks. L. Palleschi states that he is not a traffic expert and that is why they hired Greenman-Pedersen, he apologizes for their not being here tonight. He states that there is an increase in traffic on Daniels Road. T. Yasenchak asks if he can find in the report the amount of the traffic increase over the last several years. She asks if anyone knows if there are weight restrictions on Daniels Road. B. Duffney states that it is 4 tons. T. Yasenchak states that the Town of Greenfield does not have its own police department so when there is an issue with speed or traffic laws, that is something that we have to go to the Sheriff or the State about. Also, the speed limit is not something that we set, it is something that is also regulated by the State depending on the road class. The Town Board and the Planning Board do not post the speed limit. The Town can petition the State for a reduction of speed limit and that has happened in the past where we have, on behalf of the neighbors, requested that a road speed limit be reduced. That is something that we can talk about and recommend to the Town Board. H. Schwartzman asks if the traffic study includes pedestrian and bicycle traffic. T. Yasenchak states that she does not believe so, just vehicles. S. Weeks states we have discussed a site visit and he thinks we should do that before the next meeting so that the Planning Board can see the site, move around it. He thinks that is very important for us. S. Weeks asks if the applicant feels that they absolutely need access to Daniels. F. McNeary states that he does not, but for emergency purposes, fire protection, that is why he planned on putting the second entrance there. He wants to reiterate that they have a gated front entrance at Denton Road and the plan was to have the entrance at Daniels also be gated. Regarding pedestrians, people walking dogs, etc. – not a problem if this is a cut through for walking. Their speed limit is 15 mph. It is a much safer place to walk and they have had some people come and walk thru the development. He does have a problem with people bringing in pets because a

August 27, 2013

number of years ago they had a gentleman walk in with a dog, who lunged at one of the residents who fell and broke his hip. As far as people who are considerate of the residents, not a problem. He does not want this to be a cut through to Daniels Road. He reiterates that he does not have to go out to Daniels, unless we have emergency services who say that they do. T. Yasenchak questions that we did something with another subdivision that there is an egress road for emergency services. S. Weeks states that they did not have sight distance and we reduced the speed. T. Yasenchak states we also required them to have another driveway access to get out, but it is only for emergency use. She states that if the applicant does not feel that they need this entrance, they could talk to the Fire Department about emergency access. Making that portion of the roadway something other than blacktop is discussed. F. McNearly states that stone is fine, but he would prefer it to be blacktopped. He states that he would like to work with the other neighbors on Daniels Road and one of the Boards to try to get something taken care of with Daniels. B. Duffney comments that if the entrance from Daniels were grass, that would not work in the spring. He would like to see the other entrance for emergency use, as it is a big complex. It would have to be blacktopped to be able to hold a fire truck and it would have to be wide enough. The turn radius needs to be considered also. J. Streit asks if the secretary could highlight the public comments for the Town Board. He encourages the people who spoke out on the safety issues to make sure that they attend the Town Board meetings, that is the only place where this problem can be addressed. He encourages them to keep their eyes out for when that meeting is and repeat their well-articulated comments. He also suggests that Prestwick meet with the Fire Department and discuss the issues that B. Duffney brought up. T. Yasenchak states that we have yet to see actual PUD language, we have a narrative. F. McNearly provides the PUD language at this time. A. McKnight points out an error on the front page of the PUD language. T. Yasenchak asks that in looking at the PUD requirements, is there any other way that the PUD can try to achieve public benefits. F. McNearly explains that Prestwick Chase is a 55 and older community, they are not putting any children in the school systems; they are paying school and property taxes. They are a gated community and take care of their own roads. There is no maintenance by the Town of Greenfield. He explains the sewer system and how other residents may be able to connect to that. They have also brought natural gas into the area. He indicates where it is now and where it will be continued to. He has had nothing to do with what is going on with the talk of the water line on Denton Road. They have plenty of water in their community with the wells they have and the 128 thousand gallon water tank. He states that if at any time in the future there has to be a continued water district going up Daniels or Locust Grove Road, there is a lateral that it can be tied into. Out of 168 units right now he has roughly 50 cars in the parking lot and out of those 35 move. They are not putting a whole lot of traffic into the community. The residents rely on Prestwick to transport them. They do have quite a bit of green space. They try to keep most of the vegetation. The less mowing he has the better. They try to keep it natural. He states that they did try to keep this away from Country Squire. He did not think of the Bed and Breakfast and apologizes for that, but he will switch screening if necessary, also for P. Goutos and some of the other neighbors. He likes to be a good neighbor. They had originally gone with Victorian Street lighting and they are not the greatest. They plan to replace them with down lighting and they shut them off at 11:00 p.m. Site visit is further discussed and set for September 3 at 6:00 p.m.

DAVE EVANS –Minor Subdivision; Lot Line Adjustment

Plank Road

Dave Evans is present. A. McKnight recuses himself. T. Yasenchak states that the applicant was asked for some additional information at the last meeting. A map was submitted showing the lot lines a little bit better. This is for a minor subdivision of lot 3 into two lots and a lot line adjustment of lots 4 & 5. D. Evans states that he has spoken to his surveyor who cannot do this until September. J. Streit states that the only reservation that he has is as was expressed by our Town Engineer of how do we maintain access of 3 driveways. That would be less than ideal. M. Gyarmathy states that he agrees with the Town Engineer and J. Streit as far as 3 people sharing a driveway, he does think that it can result in problems down the road. T. Siragusa states that he read the Q & A that D. Evans provided. The first question was why should the Town

August 27, 2013

grant permission for the minor subdivision and the applicant's reply was why shouldn't they. T. Siragusa asks if the applicant has a better answer. He questions why the applicant would even put the question there with no answer. He states that it is a pretty big deal, the shared driveway for 3 lots, and the intent that a road would be better and it seems like we are avoiding putting a road in. You can tell that the Board is pretty hesitant on a really long shared driveway for 3 lots. When he read the Q & A he thought that there would be a really compelling reason to do that. D. Evans states that at the density that the Town prefers he cannot afford to put in a road designed for thousands of people a day as opposed to a shared driveway which would handle traffic for 3 lots. In terms of the impact on the community, it is going to be ¼ of a mile back into the woods where it is not going to be visible to anyone. In terms of whether it is 2 lots or 3 on the shared driveway, the difference is if it is minutes or hours between cars. If cars do meet there is a provision in the State law that requires passing zones every 500 feet and he can certainly meet that. There is a subdivision on the south side of Plank Road that was approved in 1984 and currently has 4 lots on one shared driveway. It previously had 5, but that house burned down. His own lots 6, 7 & 8 are all on one shared driveway. He does not understand the difference between 2 and 3; it is not a great amount of traffic. He states that if he puts in a road, it is going to cost him more than he can get from the lots. T. Siragusa states that there is no question about that. He questions then what the applicant thinks the limit should be. There is a precedent for more, but it is not a good precedent. He states that it is 2 and then 3; 3 becomes 4, etc. D. Evans states that he does not think that is possible. T. Siragusa states that he generally does not like the idea, he states that it was tough getting to the one lot 3 in the back and now there are two proposed there and he thinks that is a lot to ask for. He understands the challenge. S. Weeks questions that the other shared driveway for lots 6, 7 & 8 has to meet the standard for a driveway to a keyhole lot. T. Yasenachak states that those three are considered keyhole lots. S. Weeks states that has to hold a 50,000 lb, 30-foot wide vehicle and it has to have facilities for turning around to be available within 100-feet of any structure, which is a fairly stringent requirement for a road. He asks if that would be the same situation with the three that the applicant is looking for now. T. Yasenachak states that the same driveway requirement exists. S. Weeks states that that has to be determined by a licensed engineer, so there are real strict requirements for building those roads when you are doing a keyhole lot. That helps him some at least. At least initially that is going to be a very decent road and it requires turn arounds. He has real concerns about shared driveways, but with the keyhole lot requirement, that requires a very significant driveway. B. Duffney comments on the wear and tear maintenance, plowing, etc. He questions that there is another configuration with the driveways making a shared driveway for 2 lots. D. Evans states that all the maintenance will be specified in the shared driveway agreement. C. Baker states that he has expressed his concerns regarding the shared driveways. The only other concern that comes to mind is the whole issue of SEQRA and how we look at it with this particular piece of property. We have looked at a number of different options over the years on this and you need to start asking yourself the question of when are we segmenting. He states that it does not sit well. T. Yasenachak states that she does not like the idea of 3 residences sharing the same driveway because it does open itself up to problems, because we have seen that happen even with two. The fact that there were several on the subdivision across the street over 30 years ago, that is really not precedent. The code has changed several times. She would have to go back and really look at why we approved the 3 lots that are sharing a driveway. She states that having two 3-lot shared driveways on the same road seems a little dense. The flip side is that the location of this project in itself at the top of Plank Road is not very dense, so allowing one more lot, to her the density is not the problem; it is the fact of the shared driveway. She does not think that it would be changing the character of the neighborhood; she just believes we are setting ourselves up for a possible problem. We also have the lot line adjustment between lots 4 and 5, making lot 4 a keyhole lot and widening lot 5. She reads from the keyhole lot requirements. She asks the applicant what unusual circumstance would be allowing another keyhole lot when the lot as it is meets all the regulations. D. Evans states that the request is to improve the frontage for lot 5, which would change the configuration of lot 4. He states that his proposal can be altered to exclude the use of three shared driveways and to exclude the part of the lot line adjustment creating the keyhole lot. He provides a handout showing basically the same idea that he has been proposing but addressing the Board's objections to three lots on one driveway. He suggests two side-by-side driveways for lot 4 and lot 3 can share a driveway. Lot 4 could have it's own driveway with a flared end to 250' of frontage. He asks if he should ask his surveyor to draw a plan based on the preferred plan or the detailed

August 27, 2013

plan variations (drawing submitted 8/27/2013). S. Weeks reiterates that shared driveways are a future problem in general and if we can stay away from them, he thinks we should do that. T. Siragusa questions what happens if the owners of the proposed lots 3.1 or 3.2 want to resubdivide. D. Evans states that they don't have the frontage to do it. T. Yasenchak states that they would not be able to unless they bought more land or did a lot line adjustment. B. Duffney asks what the reason is for changing the lot line on lot 5. D. Evans states that it is narrow compared to some of the other lots and the lawn area extends into the right hand corner of lot 4. T. Yasenchak states that lot 4 with the flared end is just one of those technicalities. It is still a keyhole lot to her. Technically you have the frontage but you still have a 40' wide strip that goes from the frontage up, it is not that you have the frontage of the lot. Technically you do but it is still more of a keyhole. She reads from the keyhole regs. J. Streit states that if it is a keyhole lot, it has more than what a keyhole calls for for frontage. M. Gyarmathy states that he thinks it is just complicating things, changing the orientation of lot 5. He really does not understand the reasoning behind it. S. Weeks states that he thinks that the applicant is trying to accommodate us because we have said that shared driveways really bother us. He states that it might look unusual, but we have said over and over that we don't like shared driveways and the applicant is offering another option. T. Siragusa states that beside the frontage, that is the big change, that there is a direct way to lot 4. T. Yasenchak states that then the applicant is saying that he could withdraw the lot line adjustment so that lot 5 would stay the same and lot 4 would have its own driveway. D. Evans states that the additional land he has talked about is on a hillside and it is rocky. It is not something that is available for any kind of development. Most of that area is already limited because of ACOE covenants. In terms of its practicality, it is the ability to sell lot 5. T. Yasenchak states that this is the way that lot 5 was approved per the applicant's request. D. Evans asks if the Board is still opposed to the lot line adjustment on the other side of lot 5. T. Yasenchak states that she is, it still makes lot 4 a keyhole lot, she thinks it is trying to back-end our zoning regulations. She does not agree with it. They have the frontage; we went back and forth with some of these lots in the past to make sure there was enough frontage, etc. D. Evans points out the triangular piece of lot 5 extending into lot 6 and asks if there is any objection to that. T. Yasenchak states that she has no objection to that, it is not changing the frontage, it is just adding acreage to lot 5. Discussion takes place that the applicant is changing his request to the following: Lot line adjustment of lot 5 into the triangular area of lot 6; Lot 4 will have it's own real frontage; lots 3.1 and 3.2 will be the only lots sharing the driveway. Public hearing is discussed and set for September 10, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.

SKIDMORE COLLEGE – PUD – Referral

Denton Road

Stephanie Ferradino is present for the application. T. Yasenchak states that we have received the additional information from the applicant. S. Ferradino states that at the last meeting they were told, procedurally, that there were three outstanding items that the Board wanted additional information on. The PUD modification – they modified one sentence in it in response to the Boards comments so that it was not Skidmore-specific about the necessity of an amendment to the entire PUD in order to change or have any additional uses beyond agricultural. They updated the site plan consistent with the discussion at the last meeting regarding the location of the entrance into the property. They have provided a letter from Copeland Environmental who went out and re-reviewed the wetlands. There was information submitted from Hanwha Solar with regard to the reflectivity. She states that the applicant appreciates the time and commitment that the Board has extended to date. They still think that this is a really good project both for the Town and the College. They have worked hard with the Board and the neighbors in order to be responsive and modify the project consistent with the questions and issues raised. T. Siragusa states that regarding the reflectivity; he was expecting some engineered measurement of reflectivity. Mike Parillo states that the manufacturer has not performed any reflectivity tests. The modules that they are using meet or exceed industry standards in their design to absorb the energy from the sunlight. They use an anti-reflective glass. It has been measured at other sites at 2% or less reflectivity and the modules that they use meet or exceed those measurements. S. Weeks states that he went on line because he realized that there was no specific number and he could not find a specific number from anyone anywhere. He found a report from airports talking about as little as 2%, but

August 27, 2013

nowhere could he find an actual number. He states that he has been to 2 of these sites and he is pretty convinced that glare is not an issue. It is unfortunate that there is not an absolute number, but apparently no one is giving one at this point. B. Duffney reiterates that he visited 2 sites and he agrees with S. Weeks. He spoke with the neighbors regarding glare and there were no issues. The one site you cannot see from the main road, the other site is at a distance from the main road. A. McKnight states that Skidmore has been very responsive, very quick at answering all the Board's questions and he appreciates that. M. Gyarmathy states that he also went on line and also could not find any specific number for glare. He did find the airport studies, nothing specific though. He thanks the applicant for providing the information. T. Yasenchak asks the applicant to speak to the additional wetlands mapping. D. Carr states that the applicant asked Copeland Environmental, Kim Copenhaver, to go back out, reaffirm the wetlands and note any changes. The map that the Board received shows that, as many of the neighbors suspected, that some of the wetlands had expanded and included an isolated area. He states that they are still well away from the flagging that was newly located. Even with the new reaffirmed wetlands, there are no impacts. In the most recent plan that the Planning Board has, it includes the plan that was shown at the last meeting. T. Yasenchak reiterates that this is not site plan review and she explains the process. She asks C. Baker about the information that has been presented for the wetlands, if he has had a chance to look at that or the information from additional interested parties and their engineers. C. Baker states that he has reviewed the correspondence from both sides, he believes that the questions that have been raised have been adequately answered at this point in time. Certainly we will look at it closer in the detailed site plan review. He believes that for PUD purposes that the questions and responses to date have been adequate. T. Yasenchak explains that during site plan review requests can be made for revisions or modifications. B. Duffney questions the washout areas. C. Baker states that that is the type of thing that would be considered at site plan review. He agrees that it should be looked at further. B. Duffney states that the applicant had proposed red maples in the field to block the solar array. He questions if they would be amendable to changing that to white pine or spruce for year round screening for the neighbors. D. Carr states that the original two buffers are a mix of deciduous and coniferous. The last, the red maple, was proposed at the last minute to break up the view of the fence. They would obviously be fine with a mix. It was not meant to screen the entire thing. He states that they left the fence a light color so that you can see it on the photographs, but they proposed to the college who agreed that the fence should be painted or stained a dark color. T. Yasenchak states that the public hearing was adjourned at the last meeting. She reopens it at 9:56 p.m. and she requests that if comments have been made in the past, there is no need to repeat them at this time. We do have letters that have been given to us that have been submitted from Sterling and D. Tuczinski.

Fred McNeary, states that there was quite a bit of discussion this evening about traffic. It was brought up on this project a while back by a couple of the Board members. In the PUD submittals, off and on, there has been talk about expanding parking areas, but he does not see it on the proposed PUD at this time. He would ask that that be taken into consideration; good planning will help with all of our traffic issues that were brought up earlier. He comments that if there is no way to delineate the areas of blacktop and areas where people can walk, they kind of co-mingle and that creates a dangerous situation. He would like to see that parking before the Board acts on this.

Aimee Rutledge, Sterling Environmental, states that the Board should have received an affidavit from her regarding the thermal impacts to the brook. One important point in the affidavit is that the site is at it's closest point approximately 100' from the brook. She looked at the study that was performed for thermal impacts and the overall study seemed inadequate and did not accurately represent what would happen with the study being performed on 1 solar module. It does not state whether or not it was operating. During operation the module would be heating up the entire time that the water is running. The affidavit states that they did not include the water temperature before, but she states that she reviewed the study and it is stated. She states that one module does not represent the impact of 7000 modules. She states that there is going to be some concentrated flow, too. They don't really describe the depth of the ground temperature recording. She looked at the responses from the LA Group. One item she wanted to comment on is the delineation and how it is now connected. She indicates a strip of about 50', the perennial stream as indicated in Kim

August 27, 2013

Copenhaver's letter to the trout stream. She states that DEC can group wetlands that are separate if they are less than 165' apart. Since DEC has not been out here since June it would be wise to have DEC look at the plan again and the newly delineated wetland area and whether or not it is an entire wet complex. That would then have the 100' adjacent area around the whole wetland extension. The LA Group had also provided the Board with a flood map as one of their attachments. It does show the class C stream going from the pond; the only problem with the map is that that panel for Greenfield was never printed. What you are seeing is available on GIS mapping, but the panel is not printed so we don't really know where the flood plain is, so she does not think that it accurately represents where the flood plain would be. There could be potential impacts. DEC's review is based on the 5/28 submission and a lot has changed - the wetland was re-delineated, ACOE has not been out there. She states that there was something about the endangered species and a Natural Heritage Program letter dated 5/15. They foiled the application and she hasn't seen that letter. Regarding the traffic study, there was discussion about having a third party review and she asks if that was done. Regarding the SWPPP comments, she states that the engineer in her office had stated that some of the curb numbers used for post development, they thought maybe the curb number was too low to accurately reflect what the post development would be for the solar array. Throughout the responses, it seemed that they glossed over the fact that DEC had been out to the site and that was reason to not have ACOE out, but she states that ACOE and DEC are looking for different things usually. ACOE has more jurisdiction over wetland areas. She states that erosion of the stream banks may cause water to concentrate in areas.

Patrick Green, attorney representing Nancy McNeary who is not a resident of the Town of Greenfield but owns adjoining property, and working with the Jayco's and Bill McNeary. He states that it is hard to argue with solar panels and windmills. Everyone, right now, thinks they are the greatest thing in the world. Even his clients are in favor of these types of energy sources, but they come at a price. He presents a photo from the applicant's own packet showing 1000 solar panels. You have to multiply that by 7 - 8 football fields full of solar panels. How does this impact the neighborhood and where his clients live? It is hard to argue with this photo times 7 within your view shed. The Jayco's have second story rooms that will look out; no one took a ladder out and asked to go on their property to see if you could see this array. They were never asked and we believe that you will be able to see this from their property. P. Green states that they believe that they did not have an opportunity to weigh in and really understand this until recently. F. McNeary looked at the possibility of alternative sites. F. McNeary is a pilot, flew over and took photos. There are plenty, at least 2 or 3 areas, and they are just getting to know the project and learning more and more about it all the time, but it appears that there could be alternative sites where the solar array could have been placed. He states that they don't know because they are just getting involved, and Mrs. McNeary was never notified, even though she is a neighbor of the Town and the Jayco's are just getting familiar with this project. What they are asking is if this was ever considered? There seems to have been in the packet that they have seen an urgency that was tied to the NYSERDA grant. The dates on the letter indicate that there was a period of time, 60 days, where the applicant could have shopped around for alternative sites, but apparently that wasn't done during that period. This was a time when none of his clients knew anything about it. This is a dramatic change to the neighborhood; it is a project that is of immense magnitude. Their question is why some more effort wasn't made to find an alternate site. P. Green states that his experience with dealing with NYSERDA is that there is nothing in here that says you can't reapply. They are asking that this be slowed down; take a closer look at some of the issues that are going to be raised in addressing this. Regarding the grant, first of all there were 60 days here where we don't know what happened and secondly, there is nothing that says you can't reapply for the grant. The funds are going to be there, they are going to be available. This is a program that has been pushed very hard by Gov. Cuomo and speaking from his experiences with NYSERDA, he has dealt with solar panel projects on a smaller scale, and NYSERDA has always said, come back again if you can't meet the deadline. He wanted to raise the issue that there might not be that urgency to get this approved for that reason.

Dan Tuczinski, attorney, states that they have been trying to respond to information they are getting from the applicant and he thinks that Pat Green makes a very good point. In his experience, this has been a very fast review and the issue that has driven this project is that we have to get this through, we have to get it

August 27, 2013

in the ground, we have to go as quickly as we can, and really the Board has had this for about 3 months. There has been a lot of data that has been submitted piece meal. There is a petition being circulated in the community against this project in a residential/agricultural area, and people are just beginning to understand what this project is and what it means. He asks the Board if they have ever had a project the size of 8 football fields in this community. This is a huge project, which is coupled with ball fields and people coming in, traffic, and people trying to react to information as they receive it, coming before the Board and expressing their points of view. What P. Green said is true and he is going to differ with S. Ferradino, about whether this is really a community based project. His experience with grants is that typically when you make an application it takes some time for NYSERDA or whatever agency it is to process this. He asks, that given the size of the project and the fact that the EPA is citing these solar fields on land fills and areas where land can't be used for other purposes, why didn't Skidmore come to the Town Supervisor or the Planning Board Chair and say that they have this opportunity to put a solar project in, we'd like to get the community involved, what is a good place to put this? They didn't do that. They got a letter from NYSERDA in March saying to let them know if they wanted alternative sites. What did Skidmore do? They didn't go to the Town Supervisor then, they didn't come to the Planning Board; they let the clock run out. They made no attempt to look at any alternative sites, they made the decision that they were going to put it here and then they come in and say that they have to act quickly because they don't have time. D. Tuczinski states that no disrespect intended to Skidmore, they are a wonderful institution, but there are a lot of people who are very concerned about this project. It isn't fair to this community to impose a project, the biggest project this community has ever seen, on such a truncated time frame. He heard one of the Planning Board members say that we have heard this already. He states that the Board has heard some of these things already, but people are just beginning to understand the consequences and there are a lot of issues that are still being vetted. He asks the Board if they have actually had a chance to read the affidavit that was submitted by Aimee Rutledge, it was in response to the latest comments by the LA Group about thermal pollution. There is a huge issue here. The DEC says you can't have water in excess of 70-degrees enter a regulated trout stream. The only test that has been done that he has seen in the materials that Skidmore has produced is a geologist from Pennsylvania with a garden hose on one panel. In that limited test there was a 50-degree differential in temperature. This dropped to 75 degrees, which is greater than the amount of temperature that you are allowed to discharge into a trout stream. This is not one panel, but 7000 panels. He asks the Board to draw a parallel. If you were going to do a traffic study and put some out on the curb at 12:00 and count cars for half an hour, and we are going to base our conclusions based on that study, the Board is going to say that is ridiculous. That is not a fair study. D. Tuczinski states that there has been no fair study of the potential impacts of heated water coming off of 7000 panels heading into a trout stream. If you look at the LA Groups report, they say 'we assume' there will not be an impact and DEC did not raise any of these issues. DEC did not have that study when they looked at this and this project has changed a couple of times. The problem the public and the community have is keeping pace with the information that is being disseminated. He states that there is a significant environmental impact issue with thermal contamination. The Planning Board is the lead agency on the SEQRA determination. Once they make findings, if they issue a negative declaration, they bind the Town Board and the community on many of these issues. He would respectfully suggest that there are differences in the record on a lot of these issues. We have consultants on both sides of the aisle who say that there are traffic issues; there are community impact issues. Typically when you have competing factions the Board will say, that they are going to have an independent consult before making a determination on SEQRA. The Board did say that earlier on traffic. Skidmore said they weren't going to have all these other things, just have the solar panels and fields. If you look at the PUD, they reserve the right to put all of this stuff in. When Skidmore came in for the solar lights proposal, that Planning Board asked them to look at the traffic impact of pedestrians coming from the Skidmore Campus along the road way. That has not been looked at on this. We don't know how many fields are going to be in play in the future. He respectfully asks the Board to commission these studies. He agrees with P. Green, there is no deadline truly here. If they want to be partners in this community, have these studies, participate in this review. The Town Board has now said that they are going to study solar panels and determine where they ought to be. He agrees. Let's slow the process down and make those determinations. He has been sitting back looking at the record and the evidence, and he would respectfully suggest that before the Board makes a

August 27, 2013

determination on SEQRA, we go back to the very basic issue. Is there the potential for one significant environmental impact? If there is, this Board has the duty to request an EIS. He states that he has identified 5 independent environmental impacts that ought to be reviewed under an EIS. Thermal pollution, we know that is an issue and the applicant's own documents say that is an issue, there ought to be a full study on that issue alone. We know there is a wetlands issue. He states that on the projects that he has been involved in, when there is a question of an ACOE wetland issue, what is the proper remedy? Contact the ACOE and dispose of that issue. He states that for some reason Skidmore is afraid to contact the ACOE. F. McNeary has stated that there are a number of areas of wet that he has documented and put photos into the record. Sterling Environmental says that if you link these areas you have a hydrologic connection and there are different wetlands that might appear to be the case. Why isn't the DEC and ACOE not back out looking at the new configuration? Traffic – he states that we still don't know, his clients still don't know, what is going to go on on these fields? How many fields are there going to be? He states that he had sent a letter to the Board on 8/7 saying that the Board can request information. Let's get the grant information; let's get the lease from Polo – that is all information that the people have the right to know to measure the size of this impact. He states that we now have a licensed engineering firm that says that there are deficiencies under the NYS guidelines in the SWPPP. There are a number of irregularities. D. Tuczinski reiterates for each of these items that the Board has a right to request additional information or to have someone independently retained to look at those items. Community impact and alternatives – the PUD legislation says that the Board is supposed to study that. If people in the community don't know about this project and they are just getting up to speed, how can you possibly determine how people in that area feel about this project? He suggests, especially since Skidmore is responsible for it's own time frame here, that the project be slowed down, that these studies properly be commissioned so that the Town Board can have the information necessary to make the ultimate approval. D. Tuczinski states that he appreciates everyone's time, he knows that people are struggling with this, but there is a lot at stake here, there are a lot of people who are worried about this project and what it is going to do in an agricultural/residential area. There is no doubt that this is a commercial project, the Planning Board has the power to ask for the appropriate studies. He urges the Board to issue a positive declaration and vet these issues carefully before the Town Board has to make the ultimate decision.

Tom Mina, Denton Road, states that he was told by someone close to Skidmore that the only reason they do not want to put it behind Van Lennep is that the meter on Denton Road is a higher demand meter and will bring more credits to them. He is not saying that he knows this for a fact. He shows the Board a picture of the area behind Van Lennep that he states is almost 8 acres now that is available, there is a meter. He thinks that someone should go out with National Grid and find out if that is true. If it is true, this Planning Board should summarily dismiss this whole project because he thinks it was fabricated. They have 8 acres that no one can see behind the riding stable and they refuse to do that. They can still change it according to NYSERDA and what we found out. Why anger 200 people? He states that he has 100 signatures and he is not going to give it to the Board until he has more, he is going to let the newspapers know about this. He states that he can live with the solar power next to him; it is not going to upset his life style. He thinks it is a bad idea and he does not want it there. Why should he look at it and the applicant doesn't? He questions why they are not putting them on the new dorms that were built with slanted roofs. He commends the Planning Board and Town Board for the jobs they do, but feels this is beyond them. To go on with this whole situation when there are other ways to solve this, that Skidmore is going to put them in Greenfield and never look at them again. He states that they get 5000 applicants a year for 700 or 800 spots at \$55,000 a year. Do you think that the kids are basing their decision on Skidmore having solar panels in Greenfield? They have another place to put this and they could start next week.

John Jayco, Denton Road, states that regarding the Board members comments on visiting the sites at Green Mountain and Cheshire, he grew up in that area, the dump that the one site is on – he put a lot of stuff in that dump. That is one of the reasons the property values didn't change. The statement was made that the Board member had spoken to the neighbors and the property values hadn't changed at all – they were put on a dump. A solar panel on top of a dump is a plus. The other site is a dilapidated racetrack. It is a plus to

August 27, 2013

have that type of thing there instead of an old stable area and barns that are falling down. When we talk about property values not changing, this is 8 acres. Neither of those is even close to that. It is going to change the property values, dramatically. He thanks the Board members for taking the time to go to the other sites and for the research that has been done.

Bob Hyndman, Denton Road, states that he would like to address something that came up at the Town Board meeting. Some people had mentioned about personal property rights and he is a big believer in personal property rights. He wants to address that and how he thinks it should be addressed here, and not as just a defense of what Skidmore wants to do but also the people who own their property. Thirty or forty years ago Skidmore moved to the north campus off of Union Avenue into Greenfield, it was annexed into the City of Saratoga Springs, the County essentially took it away from Greenfield. In that time, with all the acres that they started with and they have ended with, he believes they have over 600 acres now in Greenfield alone. They don't eat or sleep in Greenfield; they are not residents of Greenfield. They are landholders in Greenfield and in some ways we are being treated like a feudal system because of the position that they have been elevated to in the community as some sort of intellectual noble position. When you are representing the residents and the Town of Greenfield in this matter, you have to look out for the property owners, the people who live here, pay taxes here, raise families here, that have family moving here to be with them, kids taking jobs here and moving back - that is what needs to be protected, the quality of life we have. We are not some post-industrial, new age environmental thing that is happening. This is not the flavor of Greenfield. What really needs to be looked at here is that the people who live, breath, raise and develop Greenfield aren't inhibited or damaged by property owners. Other communities have these types of problems with zoning because of absentee landlords. It seems to him that all that Skidmore has been good for in the 30 or 40 years that they have been here has been to stable their horses, compost their manure and put up an industrial field. They have not developed these properties, they hold them like a bank account and we are paying the interest. They are not paying anything.

Susan Celia, Braim Road, states that she learned tonight from a previous application that when you are going to make a subdivision, the two mines stood up and said that they just want the new people to know that they are there. The Board stated that that could be put in the deed, that you are going to live near a mine. She states that she has not been a resident that long, she has made a significant investment here and no where in her deed does it say that you are going to live near 8 football fields of glass and metal. She states that if you are going to look at the issues from that perspective, she thinks you have to look at the issues from those who live here.

Greg Daley, states that he has worked at 5 Oak Farm on Denton Road for 10 years, he graduated from Columbia with a Sustainability Management degree. He understands about sustainability and what Skidmore is proposing, not just from working there. He looks out his office window and sees deer, horses, the brook – not 8 acres of solar farm. He thinks that is something that should be put on other sites that are not going to be as impactful to someone who is a resident. It is important to consider this. They are taxpayers, Skidmore isn't. That is a really important thing to consider and it is important to keep their concerns in mind.

Timothy Holmes, Collins Terrace, which is not quite in Greenfield but he is fortunate enough to look at Greenfield everyday and he is glad that Greenfield is as it is. It is a beautiful place, a well-managed town, he knows some of the former officials here and he thinks the Town has a reasonable approach to development and that the standards are high. Skidmore College is a good resident and good neighbor to a number of towns and regionally. They give to all of us on some levels. They do add value. This project represents a step forward and would be a credit to all concerned. His background includes over 30 years of serving on Boards such as this, Planning Boards and commissions, planning for the long term and doing the same thing in Saratoga County. In some cases turning to renewable energy sources which in the long term tend to preserve our environment rather than disrupt it. He credits everyone for the long hours they put in on this Board and have on this project, and he hopes that the Board will approve and welcome this project.

August 27, 2013

T. Yasenchak states that we have received a lot of information, we didn't really receive any new information tonight or maybe we have, for the Board. To go through SEQRA, she asks M. Hill the proper procedure as far as the public hearing. The Board has the ability to close it at any time as they see fit or to leave it open for the public to comment. M. Hill states that is correct, so if the Board does not anticipate any additional submissions, the Board can, at its discretion, close the public hearing and proceed with the SEQRA review. T. Yasenchak asks if during SEQRA review there is additional information that we need, through the environmental impact statement or if we see that there is additional information that we cannot answer a question adequately, at that point is it appropriate to reopen a public hearing. Not necessarily just for this project, but in general. M. Hill states that it is at the Board's discretion, but there is not a legal obligation for this Board to hold a public hearing on this matter. You have done so in order to allow an opportunity for public input, and he is not suggesting that the Board shouldn't have done that; it is not necessary to hold a public hearing to accept public input. If the Board gets into SEQRA review and an issue comes up on which more information is required and the Board requests additional information from the applicant and someone wants to comment on that information, there is no reason why you can't accept comment on it. The hope is that going through the SEQRA review, you would have everything that the Board could reasonably anticipate being necessary. T. Yasenchak asks as far as deeming an application complete, is that done before or after SEQRA. M. Hill states that the Board would be looking to make a determination whether the application is complete for purposes of SEQRA review. T. Yasenchak questions that we can deem it complete for SEQRA review but not necessarily for our advisory opinion. Once we render the application complete we have a specific number of days to give our advisory opinion to the Town Board. M. Hill states that he does not think that the determination that the application is complete for SEQRA review necessarily will bind the Board with regard to a determination that you have everything you need to render your advisory opinion. He thinks that those two things can be separate if the Board wants them to be. A. McKnight questions that if we close the public hearing, we have the right to reopen it at anytime. T. Yasenchak states that we could reopen. It does not restrict the Board from receiving additional information. M. Hill states that the Board can accept comment at their discretion if they want it. There is no requirement for this Board to hold a public hearing for SEQRA purposes. J. Streit states that we have had an adequate public hearing; it can be reopened in the future. He states that he listened very carefully tonight and he did not hear anything new. He heard a whole bunch of innuendos and things brought up, mostly regurgitation, and he would suggest that we close the public hearing, which could be reopened, and that we proceed with discussing the application. Board agrees with J. Streit's comments. T. Yasenchak states that she is going to adjourn it for now so that the applicant can address some of the comments that were made. She asks about the response from ACOE. D. Carr states that Kim Copenhaver went out, re-flagged the wetlands, and she is a professional wetlands scientist. She basically reflagged the wetlands, she supplied the Board with a letter and she has sent a request to the Corp to come out and affirm her wetland flagging. She is confident in her flagging; she was employed by the Corp for many years. Given that the site is 119 acres if there was a difference of opinion with the Corp, as the Chairman stated, in site plan we can simply shift something, however they are very confident in the flagging. T. Siragusa states that a request was made for ACOE to come out and what is the response to that. D. Carr states that they have not responded. The reason K. Copenhaver did that is given the Board's review at this time, she stated the time concern, etc. The request was sent on 8/16 and she felt that they would respond within a couple of weeks. Hopefully this week or the week after she can get a verbal confirmation of the wetland flagging. That is what they are looking for, to get them on site. T. Siragusa asks why a verbal confirmation rather than a written. D. Carr states that in her mind it is a verbal confirmation because she meets them out there and they actually walk the flagging. If there is an adjustment, they discuss it, the flags get moved and they get resurveyed. T. Yasenchak asks C. Baker the more stringent of the two as far as setbacks from wetlands, DEC has reviewed it and they have a 100' buffer. What more could ACOE do? C. Baker states that it is possible that the ACOE, when they do their verification, may require the flags to be readjusted, because they have a different way of determining their wetland jurisdiction. One of the things that he would definitely look for in the detailed site plan review, and he has discussed this with the LA Group, is that we would want a JD or a non-jurisdiction letter from the ACOE before making an recommendation on decision. That is something that will come in the detailed site plan review. D. Carr states that there was no revision to the wetlands at that connection point, that was the

August 27, 2013

50' culvert at the pond, that was identified on the map and DEC did look at that when they were out in the field. The applicant specifically asked them to look at that. That was reviewed and DEC affirmed their original mapping that was done in 2004. They have different criteria than the ACOE. T. Yasenchak questions the 100' buffer. D. Carr states that that has not changed. T. Yasenchak states that from the comments there seemed to be a belief that the road and fencing are in that. D. Carr states that that is not correct. It is outside of that. T. Yasenchak states that in the PUD language, no one would be allowed to do anything until they went through site plan and that is never even a given that that would ever be approved for any kind of amendment to the site plan. How does that play in there when you are talking about permitted uses in the PUD in addition to the MDR2 district? Then later it is stated that it would not be expanded, it would just be agriculture, no increase in the number of fields, etc. S. Ferradino states that at the last meeting the feedback from the Board was that they had originally restricted it so that Skidmore couldn't develop anything at that site other than agricultural uses and the Board was uncomfortable with that. Skidmore obviously doesn't want to have to own the property forever as an agricultural use. We can't bind future potential owners to simply agricultural use so they modified this in order to say that any expansion at this site beyond agricultural will require the owner to go right back through this entire process again. If you wanted to develop a kennel/strip mall/nursing home, all acceptable uses in the MDR2, you need to go back through the entire process to amend the PUD. T. Yasenchak states that if it states all those uses are allowed, then it seems to her that if someone were to purchase that land, they would just have to come in for site plan because all those uses are already permitted. M. Hill states that the more restrictive provision in the PUD would apply. The more restrictive provision says that no expansion beyond agriculture would be allowed without coming back to the Board. Discussion takes place that if the PUD is approved, that something happens during site plan and the applicant decides not to go through with the solar array, the PUD is still in place. In that scenario, since the solar array would not be installed, under that circumstance, then M. Hill thinks that the initial part of Section 5 regarding the uses allowed with the MDR district would be operative and they could look to other potential uses that would be allowed in the MDR district in addition to the items that are enumerated. T. Yasenchak asks if the panels are being owned by Skidmore and just maintained by the contractor. M. Parillo states that it is being operated by Skidmore. T. Yasenchak states that they are being installed, built and maintained by Dynamic. T. Yasenchak states that there is no lease so Skidmore is directly dealing with National Grid as far as the whole transfer. M. Parillo states that there is a lease on the land for the footprint of the solar array. Technically Skidmore operates it but allows the contractor to maintain it. T. Siragusa states that that lease continues through the lifetime of array. B. Duffney states that F. McNeary had had a question about the parking not being on the plan. D. Carr states that it is on the plans, we had discussed this at the last meeting. They have designed a parking area for 55 cars with a turnaround. T. Yasenchak states that the applicant had submitted a revised site plan. D. Carr states that he believes it is part of the PUD language that Skidmore is obligated to come back for site plan approval for that. That is the only parking proposed. S. Ferradino states that there is existing parking that is separate from that for polo. D. Carr states that there is no specific parking area for polo, they just pull off the gravel road. S. Ferradino states that they are not using the baseball parking when they have the polo practices. B. Duffney asks that the applicant believes at this point that that is adequate parking. D. Carr states that they do. T. Yasenchak states that as was discussed at the last meeting as well, it is in the PUD that a temporary special use permit is required for large events with 100 participants. As part of that going through the special use permit process we do have it in our regulations that we do look at vehicular movements and parking, trash, etc. The public hearing is closed at 11:08 p.m.

The Board discusses beginning the SEQRA review. A. McKnight asks if once we begin the process that we have to go until we are done, 2:00 a.m, or next time, etc. The Board adjourns for a break at this time.

Meeting is reopened at 11:18 p.m.

RESOLUTION – SKIDMORE, Public Hearing

MOTION: T. Siragusa

SECOND: J. Streit

August 27, 2013

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board closes the public hearing for Skidmore College for its Planned Unit Development SEQRA and advisory recommendation review process for property located at 100 Denton Road, TM#152.-1-75.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Gyarmathy, McKnight, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak
Noes: None

Discussion takes place and M. Hill states that aside from the Town Board, there are no other involved agencies that have been identified for purposes of this application. The Town Board will make the decision with regard to the formation of the PUD and this Board does site plan review for the proposed solar array, but there aren't any other involved agencies that have been identified.

RESOLUTION – SKIDMORE, Lead Agency

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: S. Weeks

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board declares itself Lead Agency for Skidmore College for its Planned Unit Development SEQRA review process for property located at 100 Denton Road, TM#152.-1-75.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Gyarmathy, McKnight, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak
Noes: None

RESOLUTION – SKIDMORE, Complete Application

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board deems the application of Skidmore College complete for its Planned Unit Development SEQRA review process for property located at 100 Denton Road, TM#152.-1-75.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Gyarmathy, McKnight, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak
Noes: None

The Board begins the review of the part 1 of the long form SEQRA. A. McKnight questions that #14 refers to scenic views important to the community. He questions that the word 'views' is referring to the fact that on the KROD you can see all the way to the Green Mountains. Could you just construe that to mean just the forest itself? M. Hill states that the critical aspect of this is "known to be important to the community". If there is a general consensus that there is some view of the project site that there is general knowledge in the community that this is a view that is known to be important to the community, that is the operative part of that. A. McKnight asks the community at large as opposed to the neighbors. M. Hill states the community at large. Page 5, #1, b – this is the revised number to include the parking lot expansion. The words "for proposed solar project" are to be struck. Page 5, g – discussion takes place that the traffic study was based on events and not hours. The consensus is that there would be approximately 55 trips per hour. Discussion takes place regarding the inverter building's dimension. D. Carr states that they took the measurements off of the elevation. Discussion takes place regarding the topsoil removal. D. Carr states that no soil is to be removed. There will be trees removed and any of that soil that is disturbed would be reused. The topsoil will be stripped off of where the gravel road will be and will then be reused. S. Weeks questions that the amount of acreage to be developed and the remaining undeveloped do not add up to 100%. D. Carr explains that the difference is the amount of acreage that is already developed for existing uses. C. Baker states that technically those areas exist so they are not to be developed. A. McKnight confirms that the dimensions for the building, 14 tall, 44 long and 11 feet wide is in the plans. D. Carr locates the correct page of the elevations indicating that the building will be 16' 5" wide x 41' long and 16' high. A. McKnight states that he seems to remember a discussion about it being only 8' tall and set into the ground. D. Carr states that is

August 27, 2013

correct, that was before they actually put the building around the inverter. The original plan had no structure around it. The building was put around it for noise attenuation. T. Siragusa raises the question of whether the cars that were dumped in the brook, of which DEC is aware, would be considered hazardous waste. C. Baker states that this question is dealing with things that are truly hazardous, he does not believe that a few junk cars would constitute hazardous waste. B. Duffney asks about DEC and ACOE being included as involved agencies. C. Baker states that no permits have been identified by either of these agencies so they are technically not an involved agency. A. McKnight states that his only objection to the whole project has been the disruption of the forest and the agriculture, but when he sees that compared to office buildings or a shopping center, it is almost less of an impact. S. Weeks states that he compares it to wind turbines that the committee and the Town had said should be allowed in any location of the town. J. Streit states that they would be more obtrusive. T. Yasenchak states that we can state that we do not have anything in the code for solar. M. Hill reiterates that we are not talking about impacts here, but there are other potentially large types of uses and the Board can judge whether or not the proposed project would be consistent with those. T. Yasenchak states that she does not believe that this is compatible with the adjoining surrounding uses. Once you start looking at the impact we can answer that better. She is not sure how it meets our local land use plan. S. Weeks states that when you look at the total acreage, that is the way he is viewing it, looking at the total PUD. They are maintaining open space, we have recreational and agricultural. When you look at the total complex he is ok with that. T. Siragusa questions why T. Yasenchak feels that it is not compatible. T. Yasenchak states that the whole reason they are doing a PUD is because we don't have that in our language. T. Siragusa questions if all PUD's answer C, 8 with a no because of that reason. T. Yasenchak states that you can have a residential PUD. She reiterates that the whole reason we are doing a PUD is because solar is not in our regulations. J. Streit suggests accepting the applicant's answer and taking up the matter in the impact area. Discussion takes place about continuing the review process at this time. A. McKnight suggests continuing this to the next meeting to be fair to everyone and think clearly. Discussion takes place about the possibility of calling a special meeting. S. Weeks states that he is concerned with the other things that are on our plate that the next regular meeting may go 4 or 5 hours. J. Streit asks if we can start an hour early if we announce it to the public. T. Yasenchak states that we have a public hearing scheduled for another application for the next meeting. A. McKnight states that he has found an inaccuracy on page 9, number 3 – the list of uses allowed in the MDR2 zone. He states that these are not allowed in MDR2. The tables are reviewed. He states that he will think of #6 entirely differently without those uses. S. Weeks states that the information for the wind turbines is incorrect on the use tables and area tables. M. Hill states that since there are questions about the allowed uses, perhaps the question should be referred to the Zoning Administrator prior to the next meeting. Consensus is that the September 9, 2013 meeting will begin at 6:00 p.m. with Skidmore being first on the agenda.

The meeting is adjourned at 12:32 a.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary