

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

December 10, 2013

REGULAR MEETING

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by Tonya Yasenchak at 7:02 p.m. On roll call, the following members are present: Tonya Yasenchak, Michael Gyarmathy, John Streit, Stan Weeks and John Bokus, Alternate. Nathan Duffney, Andrew McKnight and Thomas Siragusa are absent. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer and Mike Hill, Town Attorney, are present.

MINUTES – November 26, 2013

MOTION: S. Weeks

SECOND: J. Streit

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of November 26, 2013, as submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Duffney, McKnight, Siragusa

Abstain: Gyarmathy

PLANNING BOARD CASES

GERARD & CHRISTOPHER CHWAZ – Special Use Permit Extension

NYS Rt. 9N & Spier Falls Road

Gerard and Christopher Chwaz are present. T. Yasenchak reviews that the applicants have Special Use Permit approval and they are here for an extension as it will expire January 13, 2014. She asks the applicant about the progress they have made. G. Chwaz states that they have the septic system in and approved by DOH. They have the heat in and the water lines. There are some things they still need to finish, and then need to get DOH and G. McKenna in for final approvals, but don't feel they will be done by the expiration date. C. Baker states that he has nothing to add. The septic system was the one thing that was still out there and his understanding in talking with G. McKenna and the DOH, it has been corrected. T. Yasenchak questions what we have done in the past about a public hearing. R. Rowland states that because they have been coming in prior to expiring, the Board has just re-approved their application.

RESOLUTION – G. & C. Chwaz, Special Use Permit

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: S. Weeks

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants a one year extension of their Special Use Permit to Christopher and Gerard Chwaz for property located at 2 Spier Falls Road, TM#112.-1-24.2, as follows:

- **One year extension of the Special Use Permit to expire January 13, 2015**

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Gyarmathy, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Abstain: Duffney, McKnight, Siragusa

December 10, 2013

AXEL SONDHOFF – Site Plan Review
Daniels Road

Jere Tatich, Elan Planning and Design, is present for the applicant. T. Yasenchak recuses herself. J. Tatich states that Kurt Bedore is the project engineer and they are representing Dr. Sondhoff as he is performing emergency surgery tonight. He reviews that the property is located on Daniels Road and the intended use is a veterinary clinic/hospital for surgery. The site is 7.5 acres, it is generally wooded with a mix of hardwood and white pine, there are some flat areas in addition to some hilly areas. The adjacent property owners are the railroad and two private holdings on the other side. The site was recently subdivided with approximately 1.5 or less acres of wetland on the site. They have been flagged and surveyed. They have not done a topo survey and are preparing to do that within the week. The whole intent is to minimize as much disturbance as they can over the acreage and they are looking at approximately 1 acre, plus or minus, of disturbance based on the sketch plan. Access to the site will be at the location of a current culverted driveway that is on Daniels Road. It is shown on the plans. The intent is for the circulation to go somewhat deep into the site to a level area in the back. They are looking at maintaining the existing vegetative cover along the stream. They are not looking at modifying any of that. The roadway will be a loop configuration that goes around the agricultural style building and that will accommodate circulation for trailers bringing horses onto the site. They have parking for three horse trailers, fairly large ones, semi's if needed, as well as parking for 4 personal vehicles. At this point they are looking at the roadway surface to be compacted aggregate, perhaps an oil and chip surface. The barn structure will be approximately 35' x 95', and they do not know if it is going to be a one or two story right now. There is an ancillary building, a small shed building, for storage of probably hay, propane and other gases that the doctor would need for surgical procedures. They have a temporary refuse storage area. Utilities – they are looking at drilling a well for an on-site water source, they have mapped out the existing wells for the adjacent properties and they are looking at staying outside the zones of impact for the existing wells. They will utilize an on-site septic system and the site provides plenty of space to provide for future expansion or modifications to the system. Electrical will come in from the road, eventually the doctor will need 3-phase power but right now they are perhaps looking at 2-phase. That would be a buried electrical service that comes in from Daniels Road as well as a digital cable line and telephone service. They are looking at handling storm water on site. They have identified an area for the storm water collection and treatment, between the access drive and the wetland to the northeast. The intent is to minimize as much disturbance as possible on site, and that is one of the reasons they have located the project towards the back of the site. That will allow for them to do the least amount of soil disturbance. They do have a fairly large knoll on the site that is indicated by 'HP' on the site plan. There are photos on the site plan and J. Tatich explains those. They will use indigenous landscape material as possible. They are not expecting a lot other than ground cover, turf grass in the area. C. Baker states that in the storm water narrative he is curious to see how they are going to protect the wetlands with the oil and chip surface. M. Gyarmathy asks if the driveway is going to be lit with pole lights. J. Tatich states that the doctor does do surgery at night based on emergency cases. Business hours will primarily be during the day. There will be area lighting for nighttime use of the site. There will be a sign, which will be minimally lit, out at the front of the driveway and a control gate. The intent is to have minimal lighting going up the driveway and it would be down-lighting. The area around the barn doesn't need to be over lit by any means. M. Gyarmathy asks if the dumpster is going to have a fence around it. J. Tatich states that they have not talked about it. M. Gyarmathy states that it might be a good idea for animals, etc. S. Weeks states that he assumes that there will be medical waste and that it will be taken care of in some other manner that is not going to go into a septic system. He guesses that they are sure that the curve is wide enough to swing a semi around there, that would be the only question he has about the driveway setup. J. Streit asks if they are talking about ordinary refuse. J. Tatich states that they are envisioning there are going to be three types of waste on site – household or office type trash, some medical waste and then manure. All the stalls are pretty much interior to the building and they are not looking at long term stays. J. Streit states that he is assuming that the doctor is aware of how to dispose of 'sharps'. J. Tatich states that their intent is to get the survey work done, do the perc tests for the storm water management system and septic, and develop the site plan drawings. He asks if it is necessary to do a sight distance study. C. Baker states that he does not recall

December 10, 2013

an issue at this location. J. Tatich states that if it becomes necessary they will do it. M. Hill questions that the SEQRA form was actually submitted in December of 2012. R. Rowland confirms this. J. Tatich states that they anticipate having the information available prior to the second meeting in February. J. Streit suggests they contact the Town when they are ready.

PRESTWICK CHASE – PUD Amendment

Denton Road

Luigi Palleschi is present. T. Yasenchak states that the applicant submitted some information yesterday and that the Board is just seeing it tonight. L. Palleschi states that there is a letter from the traffic engineer who has reviewed the information from the Town's traffic study. The traffic engineer has looked at that and according to their analysis; they still conclude that the August 2013 traffic analysis is still valid and that it is not affected by the presence of any school buses. He reads from the report. The presence of school traffic does not typically coincide with PRM traffic. The peak hour of the proposed development is in the p.m. peak hour so the school buses are not going to affect the peak p.m. hour of this proposed development. As part of the analysis on Daniels Road, the level of service is an A/B, which basically means that there is plenty of capacity. Even if there was a high margin of error and you go to a level of service of C, which is another level down, that still shows that there is enough capacity on Daniels Road. L. Palleschi states that they feel that with the traffic engineer's second look at the Town's traffic and the study that was done in August, it should be sufficient to address the SEQRA. There is also an attachment from the Saratoga Springs City School District Transportation Department indicating the number of school buses that the district owns in addition to the number of students served. The next item that needed clarification was the air conditioning units. L. Palleschi has provided spec sheets on the air conditioning units. He states that the units are self-contained heating and cooling units. There is no outside condensing unit, which will resolve the noise issue that the Planning Board had. These are the units used in the existing facility; they work well and hold up well. L. Palleschi states that F. McNeary stated that since he has been there, 16 years, they have only had to replace one unit out of the 170 +/- units. T. Yasenchak states that the spec sheet states that they have 'low operating sound levels for quiet operation' but the wall opening is about 29" x 29". She asks if there is any information about the sound. L. Palleschi states as far as decibel readings no, but it is a residential unit, it is comparable to any other residential unit for a home. M. Gyarmathy states that it is located inside the building. T. Yasenchak asks if it is directly inside the building. L. Palleschi states that it is within a closet. T. Yasenchak asks if the opening is in the exterior wall or is there ducting that goes to that. She is still concerned about what that noise is. There still is noise associated with it so the question that the Board had asked before was that when we have 'x' number of units in the North section, what is that noise. L. Palleschi feels that the information they have provided states that the closet is interior and that the unit sits within the closet. The closet is 2 x 6 construction with insulation. T. Yasenchak states that they are self-contained, but there is a vent in every unit and on the other side of that vent there are fans and blowers that work. L. Palleschi states that these are not vented outside; there is an intake that goes to the unit. C. Baker states that it looks like the penetration to the exterior wall is for louvers, which he assumes is to draw the fresh air into the unit. T. Yasenchak agrees that it appears to read that way. L. Palleschi believes that there is an intake from the exterior to the internal unit inside a closet. S. Weeks states that the company might not have it, but what the Board was asking for was the decibel level right outside or 5' away from the unit. L. Palleschi states that he does not believe it is measureable to another residence. T. Yasenchak refers to units installed in a retirement center on West Avenue in Saratoga where the units have closets right next to the balconies and they have the louvers. You don't have a 30" duct work that goes through the whole apartment to a closet that is within the apartment. These are usually at the exterior wall and that is where the fan/blower is. T. Yasenchak states that 'low' is not a number and the Board is asking the applicant to quantify what that is. The Board was also concerned about the Fire Department coverage and T. Yasenchak states that G. McKenna had a question about fire access roads around the buildings and the site. Mike Chandler, Greenfield Fire Department, is present. He states that the Fire Department likes the concept, they like the

future for the community as well because it is going to be a pretty good sized project, which will create a tax base. He states that he did not have a lot of
December 10, 2013

time to go into great detail, but they are in favor of the whole concept. He spoke to F. McNeary who wants M. Chandler to be involved throughout the project and they can deal with whatever comes up along the way. He states that he has worked with this architect on previous projects. T. Yasenchak states that then the Fire Department has the proper equipment to access the buildings, the type of buildings, etc. M. Chandler concurs and states that they understand the construction plan and where the applicant intends to begin construction, etc. M. Chandler states that they understand the burden that will be placed on the Fire Department, but they are growing also. T. Yasenchak states that G. McKenna noted that as we go forward with the site plan review we will have to address access roads. Besides just the main roads, access roads behind buildings, etc. Peter Goutous asks if there are going to be additional roads that the public has not contemplated or been able to comment on. T. Yasenchak states that typically fire access roads are not paved roads; they are just grass and compacted so that a vehicle, in the case of an emergency, can actually drive behind a building. L. Palleschi agrees with that statement. P. Goutous states that then the representations that have been made as to the trees as screening will not diminish. T. Yasenchak states that is correct. S. Weeks states that then the response to question #19 would be small to moderate based on the Town Supervisor's letter regarding emergency services and the Fire Department's comments. The Environmental Commission submitted a draft letter dated December 7, 2013 stating that they are still reviewing the project but expressing their concerns and recommendations. L. Palleschi states that regarding item #1, the wetlands are isolated, they are non-jurisdictional, which means that they are not part of the ACOE wetlands and they can be disturbed. It is not going to affect the overall wetlands, ground water or anything of that nature. Regarding #2, suggesting creating a channel for the storm water and have DEC approve the plan, L. Palleschi states that they have a SWPPP and the applicant will comply with DEC and it will be reviewed by EDP. #3, replanting with native species - L. Palleschi states that F. McNeary has stated that he currently does not use any fertilizers or pesticides because it is too costly. He lets the areas grow and then they mow them. F. McNeary does not anticipate using fertilizers or pesticides in the future because it is costly. T. Yasenchak asks if the Town has anything in the narrative that talks about a maintenance plan as far as the green space. L. Palleschi states that there will be an operation and maintenance manual as part of the storm water, which includes a lot of the disturbed areas. S. Weeks questions the Environmental Commission's comment of 'before we can recommend approval'. T. Yasenchak states that they are an advisory opinion. M. Hill states that this is a draft letter and asks if the applicant will be going back to meet with the Environmental Commission again. L. Palleschi states not that he is aware of. He reiterates his comments on the three suggestions. He feels that they have answered the questions that the Environmental Commission raised and that they will be in compliance with DEC storm water regulations, which will also be reviewed by the Town Engineer. He believes that F. McNeary is willing to do all of those things. L. Palleschi states that since the Environmental Commission is an advisory Board, he would think that with our discussion tonight, that the Planning Board would be able to put into its recommendation to the Town Board that these items have been discussed. M. Hill states that to the extent possible, from the applicant's perspective, it would probably be helpful if the Environmental Commission was recommending to this Board and to the Town Board its approval of this proposed project. It may be helpful from the applicant's perspective, and his suggestion to this Board would be to ask the applicant to have further dialog with the Environmental Commission to let them know exactly what the applicant would offer in response to these draft suggestions and see if that is acceptable or satisfactory to the Environmental Commission so that when they do the final letter of recommendations to this Board, that would seem to be a way forward. C. Baker suggests that right now the Planning Board is in the stage of making a recommendation to the Town Board, obviously we have to go thru the whole complete detailed site plan review. These 3 items and the suggestions are going to come out in the detailed site plan review. Maybe the wording should be more to the effect that 'we agree with the concepts at this point in time and would suggest that during detailed site plan review the Planning Board take a look at the following items'. L. Palleschi states that he would like to do a response letter back to the Environmental Commission regarding these three suggestions so that they can have that by their next meeting so that they can take that into account when they finalize this letter. T. Yasenchak states that would work and also if we could have something from F. McNeary about his intentions for the yard maintenance.

She asks if the applicant can get the information requested to quantify the noise of the air conditioning units and the number in that specific area, and the information for the Environmental Commission. L. Palleschi
December 10, 2013

asks if a determination of completeness could be done at this time. The Board consensus is to wait for the information requested and complete SEQRA before deeming the application complete. T. Yasenchak states that there is also a time frame in which to render a decision once the application is deemed to be complete. M. Hill states that those are the proper steps and the Board is not yet in a position to make a determination with respect to SEQRA. Without making that determination they are not in a position to make a recommendation to the Town Board yet either. C. Baker states that he took a look at the elevations that T. Yasenchak had asked him about. He asks L. Palleschi to explain if he has the ground floor elevations on the existing building and then the top of the berm. L. Palleschi states that the ground floor elevation is 349 ½' and the top of the berm is 346'. C. Baker states that then the top of the berm is lower than the elevation of the building. T. Yasenchak states that when you are in the driveway, the berm is higher than the floor of the building. C. Baker states that it appears that way from Denton Road as well. L. Palleschi states that he can verify the elevations. C. Baker states that he believes that the floor elevation is correct and that the berm may be incorrect, he thinks it is higher. He states that he did look at the original site plans that were done for that building and he believes that the finished floors are correct, but he thinks what may be incorrect is the elevation of the berm. The next Planning Board meeting will be January 14, 2014.

THEODORE MAKKAY – Major Subdivision

Goose Hollow Road

Rob Fraser from the LA Group is present representing the applicant. He states that he is here to give the Board an update as to where they are with the project. He states that they are in the final subdivision phase of the project with the Planning Board and have responded to the Planning Board's and EDP's comments in a narrative response and updated the plans. DOH has given verbal approval of their review of the project. They did the test wells and they have instructed him that he can go to Mylars and submit them for stamps and signature, but before that he would like to get the Planning Board's final approval. He would like to finish with C. Baker's and the Planning Board's final review before obtaining the approvals from DOH. They have had the surveyor provide the meets and bounds descriptions for each of the lots, the easements and the deed restricted areas, including the wetlands and they have been provided to the Town. The easements, restrictive covenants, etc., were drafted by the applicant's attorney and they have been provided for the Town Attorney's review. They have their ACOE jurisdictional determination approval and permit that was issued in 2011. S. Weeks states that he would defer to the Town Engineer for most of this discussion. T. Yasenchak asks where we left off as far as SEQRA on this project. R. Rowland states that it was completed and a negative declaration was issued. M. Chandler states that he does have the plans and is reviewing them. T. Yasenchak states that some of the septic may or may not be within the 100' no-cut buffer. She suggests they take a look at that as the neighbors were very concerned about that 100' buffer and we had it be a little larger buffer than normally required. We had quite the discussion about what no-cut was, etc. Probably you could have the toe of a septic in that and not disturb anything, but she asks that they just make sure. C. Baker states that he has not completed a detailed review. He asks where the applicant stands as far as the estimates for the letter of credit/bond for the road. He has no further questions at this time. There is a lot of information to go thru and it is going to take a little while to get a final letter.

SKIDMORE COLLEGE – SITE PLAN REVIEW

Denton Road

T. Yasenchak explains that because we only have one meeting this month we have extended the opportunity to any applicant who wanted to submit, to just present at this meeting even if they had not met the deadline just so that the Board could listen. We only received this information recently and we will only

be listening and maybe asking a few questions. We will not be making any decisions or formal review comments. Our next meeting will be January 14, 2014.

December 10, 2013

Stephanie Ferradino, Dave Carr and representatives from Skidmore are present. S. Ferradino states that General Dynamics were not able to be here because the storm hit Pennsylvania today, but they will be at the next meeting. As the Board is aware, the zoning approval was granted with the adoption of the PUD last Thursday. A significant part of the discussion that evening and during the Planning Board's review of the project was with regard to the landscaping and screening. They intend to make revisions to sheets L1 and L2, and they will be doing that so that the Board has time to review them prior to the next meeting. The Town Board also stressed that the best result will be achieved if the applicant is able to work with the neighbor's toward the landscaping of their properties. The applicant is very interested in doing that and hearing the Planning Board's comments towards that end. The decommissioning plan is something that is now the purview of the Planning Board as part of the PUD legislation and that was submitted to the Board. They will be working with the Town Engineer on a cost estimate for the decommissioning plan. Skidmore has also had preliminary discussions with the Fire Department and Dynamic will be working with them in order to ensure that adequate training of the Fire Department has occurred. S. Ferradino states that more specifics have been added to the original concept plan. D. Carr, LA Group, states that what the Board sees before them is the plan that they saw the last time the applicant was before the Board in October and as S. Ferradino stated, they have submitted a full set of site plans; the application form; project narrative; the decommissioning plan; the solar facility construction plans, which is all their electrical plans and construction plans for the array; and a detailed SWPPP. He explains the screening that evolved thru the original process and points the areas out on the plans and states that it totaled 36 trees. They heard that the screening was not going to be sufficient so the LA Group looked at this as kind of three levels of screening. Driving down Denton Road, east to west, you go by the baseball field and then there is some coniferous vegetation before you hit the wetlands and then it is wide open, then there is the gravel road and then T. Mina's property. The first thing they are doing is proposing to plant conifers in the open area, matching the existing vegetation, and then in-filling the gaps in the existing vegetation and the proposed trees with shrub material to make it look more natural. You will get the screening from an upper level and then from a lower level. The shrub material will go in at 3 to 4 feet. The concept is to beef up what exists and then to match that as you go down the road. The second level was when they took the photo from Denton Road on the ladder, they added some screening vegetation to an area to help screen the view across Denton Road. Now they are taking it from Denton Road, all the way back and are making it one continuous row. It is not a hedge per se, but a treed screen. The third level is that the fence is being proposed to be painted green and to add trees and shrubs to the entire length of the fence to break up the monotony of the fence and work it into the landscape. This plan totals 144 trees and 180 shrubs. The trees range in size from 6-feet to 16-feet and the shrubs are basically all 3 to 4-feet. The trees are a mixture of coniferous and deciduous. Obviously they understand that coniferous trees afford better screening, but their intent was to create something that worked into the natural environment so they didn't want to plant only coniferous trees because that is not what is out there currently. The Town Board made some comments Thursday night and they think they are going to have to re-think some of the placement of the trees. The applicant would really like to work with J. Jayco and T. Mina in the future to alleviate their concerns, if that is possible, and do the proper mitigation. That is their goal, moving forward. He states that their plan is to work with a landscape contractor in the near future because they feel that the landscape portion of this is very important. D. Carr states that they have detailed the sediment and erosion control plan so now it is a full detailed SWPPP. He states that with regard to the ravine, they have created a swale and a series of catch basins and pipes to grab the storm water before it reaches the top of the slope and bring it to the lower corner to a collection area, which would then overflow into the existing pond. Basically, effectively cutting off the run-off. S. Weeks asks if the trees along Denton will be all evergreens. D. Carr states that he thinks that they are all evergreens because that is pretty much what is there now. There are some gaps and they are going to fill those in with shrubs. J. Bokus states that it sounds like the applicant is trying to make the neighbors happy with their visual impact concerns. C. Baker suggests, if the applicant has not already done so, to provide a copy of the SWPPP to Walt Barss as he is the Town's MS4 Coordinator and will have to do the SWPPP compliance. S. Weeks states that he drove down

Denton Road today and the solar collectors that are there now were covered with snow and those are pretty steep. These are pretty shallow and he is not sure why they are at such a shallow angle. He does not know why they made them so flat in snow country. R. Rowland states that G. McKenna had one question. T. December 10, 2013

Yasenchak states he was looking for the actual lot coverage. R. Rowland states that earlier today they discussed this and he wanted the actual size of each panel. She states that she thinks it is stated in the submission to be 36 x 72. S. Ferradino states that is correct and it is on the first page of the project narrative. T. Yasenchak states that the application will be on the January 14th agenda.

DISCUSSION

Discussion takes place about the January Saratoga County Planning and Zoning Conference. R. Rowland reminds the Board to get the forms to her and she will submit them with a Town voucher. T. Yasenchak reminds everyone to take a look at the classes they are taking for the County awards.

The meeting is adjourned at 8:32 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary