

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

July 9, 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, Andrew McKnight, Thomas Siragusa, John Streit, and Stan Weeks. Michael Gyarmathy and John Bokus, Alternate, is absent. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer, is present.

MINUTES – June 25, 2013

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: T. Siragusa

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of June 25, 2013, as submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, McKnight, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Abstain: Gyarmathy

PLANNING BOARD CASES

VICTORIA BENTON – Minor Subdivision

Lester Park Road

Victoria Benton and Bill Van Bunschoten are present. T. Yasenchak reviews that the last time the applicant was before the Board she was asked to have the sight distance verified and to get a better map. Both have been submitted. V. Benton reviews that she would like to subdivide the existing house with 1.5 acres from the remaining property. She will be building a ranch house on the new lot. C. Baker asks if the driveway for the new lot will be coming off of Lester Park Road. V. Benton states that it will and she does have a driveway permit. C. Baker questions the sliver of land that goes out the other side. V. Benton states that is so that she can keep the pond and keep it wild. C. Baker states that the Town's typical notes need to be added to the plans. V. Benton states that she has those and will take care of that. T. Yasenchak states that this is only a one-lot subdivision. The Planning Board did require Old Stone Ridge to do an archaeological study, this is down below. J. Streit states that this also existing flat land and there should not be any blasting needed. B. Van Bunschoten states that they did dig for the septic. The engineer did come over and did an evaluation of that. He states that he thinks that they went down 6-feet or 7-feet before they hit rock.

RESOLUTION – V. Benton, SEQRA

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered "no" and the second box is checked, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impacts for the Minor Subdivision of Victoria Benton for property located at 4 Lester Park Road, TM#164.-1-70.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, McKnight, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Abstain: Gyarmathy

July 9, 2013

RESOLUTION – V. Benton, Minor Subdivision

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: S. Siragusa

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants approval to the Minor Subdivision request of Victoria Benton for property located at 4 Lester Park Road, TM#164.-1-70, per the map submitted, contingent upon:

- **Addition of Town’s typical notes**

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, McKnight, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Abstain: Gyarmathy

MARK YOUNG – Minor Subdivision

Ormsbee Road

Mark Young is present and explains that he originally had approximately 50 acres and subdivided one 5-acre parcel in 1997 to build his home. He would now like to subdivide the remainder into 3 additional lots with a lot line adjustment to add property to his 5-acre parcel. He states that the lines on the conceptual drawing are just his estimation as to how they will actually end up. What he would like to end up with is Lot 1 will be approximately 15 acres with 500’ of frontage; Lot 2 approximately 12 acres with 500’ of frontage and Lot 3 approximately 6 to 7 acres with 700’ of frontage. He states that there are two Town culverts, which are on the property and will appear on the survey. One is on lot 1 and he is purposely putting the lot line between lots 2 and 3 where the culvert crosses the road. He states that when the Town redid Ormsbee Road, the ditch on the other side was becoming pretty challenged with bigger rain storms so he let the Highway Department put in another culvert onto his property. There is a natural valley and ridgeline between lots 2 and 3 so it was a natural location for a large culvert pipe. He states that that has greatly reduced the amount of water going down the side of the road. M. Young states that he has had the property for sale for about 4 years and while they were building the road he decided that this was the time to do some of this work to get it established before any new landowners came in. J. Streit asks how many generations of Young’s have been on this land. M. Young states that he is the 6th and in looking at the deed, the property was last surveyed in 1846. T. Yasenchak asks if there is a reason for the lot configurations. M. Young states that they may not end up looking like this, these were his estimates. He states that the buyer he has is interested in lot 1 and he knew that the first person interested was going to get to dictate how the subdivision went. He walked the property with the prospective buyer and they came up with the frontage and roughly gave M. Young the guidance for how the lot lines might flow. J. Streit asks how the property slopes. M. Young explains. J. Streit states that this is basically hayfields. M. Young concurs and states that it has been horse corrals, farmed, logged and they tried to do things to keep the school taxes paid but the school taxes have become something that is no longer maintainable over a long period of time. M. Young states that the Ormsbee Cemetery will be part of his property. T. Yasenchak states that this is pretty straightforward. B. Duffney asks if topo should be on the survey. C. Baker states that they should along with the typical notes.

DAVE EVANS – Subdivision Amendment

Plank Road

Dave Evans asked to be postponed to the next meeting.

BALLSTON MOURNINGKILL ASSOCIATES LLC – Site Plan Review

NYS Route 9 (Maple Avenue)

July 9, 2013

Eric Carlson is present for the application. He states that this property consists of three lots – 464 Maple Avenue, 464 ½ Maple Avenue (rear), and 466 Maple Avenue – and they total about .82 acres. He states that they are before the ZBA for an area variance. What he is proposing meets the current use requirements but does not meet the acreage. He is proposing multi-family and office/retail space. He states that just about everything nearby are pretty typically .66, .7, and .8 and there are a few exceptions, some of them are 1-½ acres. He states that there is office use and multi family up and down the street so this proposal is consistent with the neighborhood. He states that he is proposing to build 4 duplexes consisting of 8 rental units, and a 2-story office building in the front. He refers to the submitted site plan and states that the units he is proposing he built recently in Rotterdam – 54 units, 1 bedroom, 750 to 800 square feet and they were all rented within 40 days. He states that it is very successful; the price point is right, very nice apartments. They put wood floors in them, nice counter tops. They would be perfect for the area, would fit right into what is there. He describes some of the other properties as having office, retail, residential. Currently what is on that property is a couple of teardowns. There is a kind of house in the front, which has been used as a number of things, it is pretty run down. Both houses have been lived in for 20 – 25 years, so they are livable but they need work and no one is going to spend the money on what's there. The area is quickly becoming non-single family residential. He feels that his proposal will be a huge improvement to what is there. At this point he is just looking to see if conceptually the Board has comments and then he can get an engineer to go the next step. E. Carlson goes over the packet provided today of the property and the adjoining uses. He states that he believes that the ZBA will agree that this is not inconsistent with what is in the area. T. Yasenachak asks if there are other mixed uses on that street that are similar to this or is he saying that there are other residences that are multi residential. E. Carlson states that he believes there is a combination. He states that there is a flower shop on a first floor with an apartment above; there is a 3-unit residential house for sale across the street but the front is an office. He states that a lot are old homes converted to offices. A. McKnight questions that the duplexes are one right after the other or are they one building. E. Carlson states that they are 22 ½-foot wide units by 32 but there is a porch on the front so it is about 38 or 40' deep total, they are 4 wide and 8 total units. A. McKnight questions that it is actually one building. E. Carlson states that it is but it is 4 duplexes because he will put a 2-hour firewall between the two units to eliminate the need for fire suppression, which would be very difficult without public water. T. Siragusa asks if there are photos of what he just built. E. Carlson states that he will get the Board copies. T. Siragusa asks if what is green on the drawing is the actual green space. E. Carlson states that out of about a total of 36,000 square feet on the lot, almost 15,000 is green if you include what he has as banked parking. The banked parking is about 1500-1600 square feet; the duplex building is about 3200 square feet and the office building is about 2500 square feet. T. Siragusa asks about the style of the office building. E. Carlson states that he really wants to stick with a Colonial style, similar to the King Industries building across the street – the colonial style with the porch. A. McKnight states then sort of a residential look. E. Carlson concurs. He states that down the street there are banks and office buildings that are brick, so there are a number of different things, but he would like to keep it more residential looking. T. Siragusa questions that the driveway is wide enough for traffic going in two directions. E. Carlson states that he has it as 22' but he will have an engineer confirm. S. Weeks asks if there is public water on Maple Avenue. E. Carlson states that there is north and south of this property but not at this property. S. Weeks asks about sewer. E. Carlson states that there is no sewer or water. B. Duffney asks about the height of the buildings. E. Carlson states close to 30-feet. B. Duffney states that he believes that when the property next door was approved for the beauty salon, they went with a well in the front of the property. E. Carlson states that it is. He states that he has spoken to DOH on the well and septic. He will be treating the septic; it will not be a standard septic system. He will be using a pre-treatment system that DEC has already looked at and approved on other projects. He indicates the location of the treatment area for the septic on the plan and the infiltration system will be right next to the duplexes. E. Carlson states that they have been through the calculations, they know that they can make the well and the septic work. C. Baker asks about the system. E. Carlson states that Orenco is what he has been using. He can get some information on it. He states that the system has been used in North Creek and it discharges straight into a Federal Stream. He has used it since as more of a pre-treatment and not a full-treatment. He has been very successful, used it on two projects so far and is three-quarters of the way through on the approval on 160 units using the same system. He has worked with Jamie Malcolm from DEC; he is very

July 9, 2013

familiar with it if anyone wants to speak to him. B. Duffney asks how much lighting will be on the premises. E. Carlson states that he would like to have enough lighting so that people can get from their cars to the buildings and feel safe. It is certainly not a bad area, but people would like to see their way from the car to the door. He does not want to cause any inconvenience for anyone, but it is mostly commercial use over there. J. Streit states that he has no conceptual questions. T. Yasenchak asks if the sidewalk is coming up to a landing. Is the landing part of the structure, is it part of the sidewalk, is it covered, what is happening at that point? E. Carlson states that on the front, towards Maple Avenue, in the theme of a colonial, he is expecting a porch to be there so the sidewalk would enter a covered porch. In the back, he is just assuming that an office building would probably have maybe 4 tenants, chances are the back entrance will get used more than the front so he is proposing a little entrance but he is not sure what that will look like - something that you can get in out of the weather. T. Yasenchak states the setbacks are actually to the porch. She questions that the applicant is showing two wells on the property. Are they drawing from both of them, are they treating those, etc? E. Carlson states that he is not sure yet. He did have some preliminary discussions with the DOH, he showed them his idea and what he is looking to do. There is potential that he could go to private wells serving the two different buildings. He will only need one well if he makes it public. Fully public would require it to be chlorinated, tested daily, etc. He is showing two wells just in case. T. Yasenchak asks if those are the existing wells. E. Carlson states that they are not, the existing wells are points in the basements of the existing structures. T. Yasenchak asks the applicant to explain the banked parking. E. Carlson states that the banked parking is something that he would like to leave green for now and if he has a need for the parking he would use that area. It is just an area that he would like to not put in immediately. T. Yasenchak states that the Planning Board can grant a waiver on requirements but needs specific information. She believes that right now the applicant needs 2 parking spaces for each unit, which would be 16 spaces and for office buildings she believes it is 1 space for each 300 square feet of leaseable space, which could be another 16 spaces. T. Yasenchak states that the Board does have the ability to waive the requirement, but the applicant would need to come to the Board with a rationale. She states that the other thing that she sees which may be an issue is that we do have requirements for buffers between where there is mixed use or office/retail and single family. She states that it looks like there is a lot to work on here; the Code spells out the requirements. E. Carlson states that his intent was to get a preliminary conceptual, that the Board is not totally opposed to the idea so he could move forward with his engineer. B. Duffney asks if the driveway is going to be paved. E. Carlson states that is his plan unless he runs into stormwater issues, which he does not think that he will. T. Yasenchak states that the site plan requirements are listed in the Town Code.

PRESTWICK CHASE – PUD Amendment

Denton Road

Prestwick Chase has asked to be postponed.

SKIDMORE COLLEGE – PUD – Referral

Denton Road

T. Yasenchak states that the last time the applicant was here, we did ask for some additional information and a majority of the Board was able to attend the site walk. She comments that the applicant will be submitting additional information tonight. Stephanie Ferradino, attorney, states that they will submit some of the information tonight and some in the days to follow. T. Yasenchak states that she adjourned the public hearing at the last Planning Board meeting, she will keep it adjourned at this point since the public has not had the opportunity to listen to the additional information, neither has the Board. Once we have received that then we can reopen the public hearing to allow the public to comment. S. Ferradino states that the applicant would be happy to hear anything that the public would want to offer tonight, just to help move the project forward if the Board is comfortable with that. S. Ferradino states that she is present with Dave Carr

July 9, 2013

from the LA Group; two members from Dynamic Solar, Greg Boyer and Mike Parillo. M. Parillo is new to the project here in Greenfield but is president of the company and is very familiar with and will be addressing some of the questions that were raised at the last meeting as well as any new questions. D. Carr states that he appreciates the attendance at the site walk and considering the weather, if the Board wants to schedule another one, they would be happy to do that. He states that Dynamic Energy provided one solar panel out there so that everyone could take a look at it. For clarification, there was a piece of plywood lying on the ground. That was a mock up that the applicant did of what it would look like, but they were able to have the actual panel out there for the walk. Basically all they did on the walk was to walk from point-to-point around the solar array and back to the parking lot. One plan modification from the last meeting, a concern was brought up regarding wet areas and wetlands, and another concern was traffic, so what they did was go back to part of the original plan in that the driveway is being tied into the existing gravel road instead of creating another curb cut. That will allow them to reduce the amount of gravel, move the curb cut and there was some concern with a specific area and they are now able to avoid that area, even though it is not wet. They will be submitting a new set of plans. The trees will remain that were previously discussed as part of the screening. S. Ferradino states that since the last meeting, they have researched some of the issues that questions were asked of the applicant. They have kind of arranged their presentation with clarifications of information and then corrections of information, and then just additional information that has come up. One of the modifications that the Town will be getting in the next few days will be yet another modification of the PUD language and that is responsive to some of the issues raised by both the Board and the neighbors. One of the things that they have added is a noise monitoring provision which would establish thresholds and require mitigation in circumstances where the decibel was exceeded by the project. They are very confident that it is not going to be exceeded, but this will provide a little bit of protection and insurance for both the neighbors and the Town that they are going to meet the standards that they have voiced to the Planning Board. The second is to require construction of additional parking at the ball fields and for that to be done by Spring of 2014. They believe that will help to alleviate the congestion issues that were raised as traffic concerns for the project. The third item was clarification and a provision that would require the college to remove any solar panels that were not being used if there was a discontinuance of use. The audience threw out the possibility of the project going bankrupt. In the event that that occurred, the Town would have the ability to enforce the removal of the solar panels within 6 months of written notification. The last change was to remove Essential Services because it is listed as a use in each of the zones, but it is not defined anywhere within the code. She states that she did not know what they were, only that they exist in every single one of the zones and there were some comments and questions. Since she does not know what it is, it will be removed. They are also going to take out open space because that is something obviously able to be in every zone on every piece of property and they did not think it was necessary. They will leave it in if the Board wants it. D. Carr states that what this map does is to highlight the wetlands that were in the original application and he provides a copy of that map along with a letter from DEC. He states that he has color-coded the wetlands and the buffers. The wetlands were mapped by Copeland Environmental and they are color-coded. He explains the map. They were able to get DEC out to the site to take a look at the cars that Will Orthwein had brought up at the last meeting and some of the Board members did see out in the field. Officially, DEC cannot make anyone remove anything in a wetland or the buffer that has been there for more than one year. Unofficially, what DEC told the applicant was that in their opinion it would be best to leave them. D. Carr states that he thinks they have been there 40 to 50 years; they have already created their own habitat. However, the College has stated to D. Carr that if the Planning Board wanted to make it a mitigation measure they would go ahead, get the permit and have the cars removed. They are kind of embedded in the bank, there is vegetation growing through them, etc. D. Carr states that they also had DEC look at the wetlands, since the LA Group did not flag them. Their wetland biologist, Rob Fraser, had looked at them and their only concern was that some of the Federally Jurisdictional wetlands, that if they become connected to the State wetlands, then there would be a buffer associated with those. DEC felt that the map is valid as it was originally mapped and that they have no jurisdiction over anything in this project including temperature. Their feeling is that if you are outside of the 100-foot buffer that they have no jurisdiction over anything that goes on with their stream. They basically stated that that is why the buffer is there. The letter basically states that this project is outside of their jurisdiction. Mike Parillo explains that to address the concern of

July 9, 2013

rainwater coming off of the panels and heating the ground water for runoff, he states that they performed a test. He explains that they placed a solar panel at the same degree angle and the same position to the sun as that in the proposed array. They put the panel out at 9:00 in the morning and let it stay in direct sun until 3:30. The temperature at that time was 91-degrees. Prior to the test, the temperature of the solar module was approximately 115-degrees. Pavement can run in the 140 to 150-degree range. They introduced hose water to simulate rainwater. They measured the temperature of the water before it was introduced; had a catch basin at the bottom of the module and they recorded the temperature there; then allowed the water to flow through a trench which was dug through a lawn area and then recorded the temperature of not only the ground, but also the water at the end of the trench. What they found was that they introduced 78-degree water, at the basin it was 86-degrees, it was then introduced into the ground which was 89-degrees and the water then took the temperature of the ground and increased to 89-degrees. M. Parillo states that as far as the solar modules, the main thing is that they do not retain the heat once water is introduced, but also the shadow effect that the modules have throughout the 8-acre parcel which will in turn keep the ground at a lower temperature than it would have been had the solar array not been there. A copy of the report will be provided. D. Carr states that another question that was brought up was cultural resources. He provides another map showing archaeological sensitive areas. This is from the OPRHP website that you are directed to when you do a project in NYState. He states that probably 75% of the City of Saratoga Springs is within an archaeologically sensitive area. The Skidmore project is in a white area and is not touched by the color indicating a sensitive area. He states that if you need any sort of State permit, from DEC or any other State agency, and this project will need a SPDES permit, this is the process you have to go through. He reads from the regulations. What you would do is place this map in the SWPPP in the archaeological section. T. Yasechak asks if D. Carr has spoken to the Town Historian. D. Carr states that he has not, but he will. S. Ferradino states that the next issue relates to traffic and that when they analyzed the comments and the minutes of the meeting, what they realized was that the issues that were given the heading 'traffic' didn't relate to what traffic studies typically study, which is trip generation. They related instead to a congestion problem at the site, which was impeding the flow of regular traffic past and through the site. In order to address those issues they took a look at what was causing the congestion and then looked at whether a traffic study would actually be meaningful, they found that it would not either be meaningful or valid because the conditions and the usage vary widely. They only occur when school is in session and primarily in the month of April. They looked at what were the triggers for causing this congestion problem, how often did it occur, what type of impacts did they have so that they could report back to the Planning Board about the usage at the site. She states that the usage that is being raised as an issue certainly is not from the solar and she believes that everyone is comfortable with 4 trips a year. The baseball use of the field seems to be kind of what is triggering the congestion issues that are noticed. Practices occur at the field during both the fall and the spring seasons but the cars generated from those practices are just from the players and the coaches, and there is more than sufficient parking within the existing parking lot that is used for this. That will be reinforced to those players if that is recommended by the Board. In the fall season there are approximately one to two games at this site during September and October in total. In the spring season there are approximately 14 games scheduled, but not all of those occur because the season runs from the end of March to the beginning of May. Those games only occur at the Skidmore field weather permitting. If there is still snow on the ground in March, there are no scheduled games. They instead play at the other teams field. In the summer, they have approximately 6 games a year for people other than the college to use the field. They feel that this is in complying with the Comprehensive Plans request for more community-based recreation by providing an avenue and a place for league play. She states that tonight there was an over 30's league game at the site. During the games, there are approximately 25 spectator cars and approximately 25 cars split between players and their families, and one visitor's bus that comes to the site. The students tend to come and go, they don't come at the beginning of the game and stay for all of it, but they think that there are approximately 60 cars that would come to any given game. If the team were so successful that they would be having a playoff, they have a commitment from the College to bus students back and forth. That has not been the case in recent years. S. Ferradino states that they have had a little section of bleachers there, which fits about 25 people and they have never had a need to increase that. Certainly some people bring their own chairs, the students probably don't have folding chairs at college, but the small bleacher that is currently

July 9, 2013

there has been there since the ball field opened and there has never been any need to expand that. The other use at the site is polo. There are two practice fields there and they practice 2 to 3 times per week. Those practices occur during part of June and then all of July and all of August so they are on a completely different schedule than the school's usage of this site. When they practice at the field they have three to 8 trucks with attached horse trailers plus about 10 to 15 additional cars. They park in the gravel area. They also have a Frisbee tournament in the spring and many of the students who participate in it are encouraged to park at the polo fields and then they are bussed from the polo fields over to the Skidmore fields. Traffic issue again that relates to parking, it is not trip generation issue. They certainly don't use the site with any regularity or frequency, so it is not like a subdivision where you are going to have cars in and out in the morning peak hours and the afternoon peak hours. It is not that kind of usage. It happens sporadically. Polo and baseball are on completely different schedules and the amount of cars that they generate are not significant. The problem really was that people are parking along the street because they were afraid of parking in an area where they might get hit by a ball or simply for convenience reasons because they are going to come and go. In addition to the modification in the PUD language which would require the College to require the parking before the next base ball season in the spring, one other mitigation measure is that the Town could actually mark a portion of that road as a no parking zone. Denton Road is a Town Road and the Town is absolutely within its power to simply put no parking signs up. That may be another mitigation measure to alleviate that concern. Regarding what was characterized as a boundary dispute between Skidmore College and Saratoga Polo, she indicates on the map where Polo currently uses a portion of the property for ingress and egress. Skidmore has known about this for years and years, it is not uncommon that sometimes property lines get blurred. The College is not concerned about it. They can formalize it with an easement, they have talked to Polo and they would be amendable to having an easement that allows them to have access through those small portions. If the Board feels that that is a necessity, they can certainly formalize that. M. Parillo, addresses maintenance of the site. He states that one of the primary benefits with solar is that the arrays themselves are very low maintenance. A question had come up about mowing; they plant a low- or no-mow grass that would grow about 6-inches and then bend over. They would plan to mow it semi-annually or as needed to keep it manicured. The leading edge of the modules is 30-inches off the ground so a standard mower can get in and around the array to mow the grass efficiently. The other question that has come up is site visits on a month-to-month or quarterly basis. He states that they are looking at quarterly site visits by a 2 to 4 man crew for maybe half a day a quarter to physically check the array. Then as far as cleaning is concerned, with the amount of precipitation that we get in the area from rain and the snow, combined with the angle that the modules are at, they are naturally self-cleaning so there is really no need for cleaning. D. Carr states that there was a question about the port-a-johns, it is really associated with baseball. There will be port-a-johns associated with the construction of the solar array that are required and that is about a 6 to 8 week period. As far as the baseball season, in the fall they are installed basically from September to the end of October for practice and then in the springtime they are installed in March and normally removed in May, sometimes they are up longer because there are some events. Typically it is March to May, while school is in session, and he believes that J. Streit had a concern about maybe putting them in a shed structure. D. Carr provides a graphic of a shed type structure, three-sided, and it is shown in the location where it would be placed on the site. The port-a-johns, can be slid in and out for maintenance and it would basically be made of wood siding and be the color of the dugouts. S. Ferradino states that regarding the issue of three contiguous PUDs, she contacted Jason Kemper at County Planning to inquire whether he had ever heard that three contiguous PUDs were not allowed. He had never heard of it and spoke to Mike Valentine about it, who had also never heard of it. She states that there is nothing in the County regulations, which address this and they pointed her to Malta where, at last count, there are either 59 or 63 PUDs within the town itself. She states that there are numerous contiguous PUDs located within the County and that does not raise a trigger, which would require the applicant to take separate action. She also reviewed the Town Code to make sure that the code did not address that and she did not find that as an issue. S. Ferradino states that M. Parillo will give the Board information regarding a noise test that they conducted and that information will be provided to the Board later in the week. M. Parillo states that they conducted a test at an existing site with an inverter enclosure, which is not an insulated enclosure. The enclosure for the Skidmore site will be insulated so there will be further dampening of sound. They took measurements of sound inside the enclosure, 1-foot from the

July 9, 2013

enclosure and 15-feet from the inverter enclosure. Within the inverter it was 69 decibels; 1 foot from the enclosure was 60 decibels and at 15 feet from the enclosure it was 55 decibels. For a frame of reference, in the 60 decibel range is conversation at about 3-feet. The size of the facility that will be tested will be in the information provided. It was about 40% of the size of the proposed facility but it had three inverters. The proposed Skidmore facility will have 4 inverters. He states that the Massachusetts DEP performed similar tests with similar findings on array sizes that were the same size as the proposed and also systems that were larger than the proposal. S. Ferradino states that in addition to the studies that were done, they have modified the legislation to provide a section which is entitled Noise Monitoring. She reads from the proposed language, stating that “the sound generated by the solar array shall not raise the ambient noise level above a maximum of 65 decibels at the nearest residential receptor.” She states that she took this language from the NYS DEC Assessing and Mitigation Noise Impacts which is the standard policy of New York State with regard to noise and that is found in DEP-00-1. “Any violation of this provision will require the owner to implement mitigation measures to bring the facility into compliance with this threshold within 60 days of notification by the Town.” S. Ferradino states that the next issue is consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. She states that in 2005 the Town was not considering solar arrays or wind or any other forms of alternative energy sources. They are not within the Comprehensive Plan and the fact that this was not contemplated by the Comprehensive Plan, however, does not mean that they do not conform to it. She states that if you look at the goals and issues outlined in the Comprehensive Plan, it breaks up into a list of categories that appears somewhere in the later part of the plan, and it talks about strategies and implementation of the Town’s goals. She states that solar does not fit into it any better than wind energy. It talks about land uses, the roads, the natural resources of the Kaydeross and Lake Desolation. Public water and sewer are discussed and she states that this project does not impact those at all because we are not going to have public or private water or sewer at the site for any reason. She states that the one area that this does fit into is recreation because this PUD will be in essence creating a site that is used for recreation and not much else. It will have a solar array on it which sits passively in a far corner, but the primary use on the site and the thing that will be impacting others the most will be the baseball games and the recreation of the polo fields. This is something that the Town strongly encourages, the development of more recreation space. S. Ferradino states that the PUD is very much consistent with that goal. The other is that if you compare the Comprehensive Plan and the Town Code, the things that people were tossing out and the terms that they were using don’t fit this site either. It is not a commercial use, commercial use is “Any use involving the sale, rental or distribution of goods or commodities, either retail or wholesale, or the provision of recreation facilities or activities for a fee or as otherwise defined by this chapter.” The definition of Light Industry – “the act of storing, preparing for treatment, manufacturing or assembling any article, substance or commodity not intended for retail sale on the same premises, not to include the storing or processing of raw material.” She states that they are not industry, they are not commercial use. If you look at what the code does and the zoning does with wind, which is the thing that they are most similarly associated with, it puts it in the park and recreation area and that is precisely what they are proposing to do with a PUD whose base is primarily recreation. M. Parillo states that one of the questions or concerns that was raised was if there were any liquids, and what they might be, in the inverter or the transformer. The inverter itself does not have any liquids in it and is cooled with a fan. The transformers are dry type transformers and they do not use oil, they just use the natural air ventilation to cool. Regarding impervious surface, when they calculated the impervious surface they took into account the concrete pad and the ballast block that is going to support the cable trays that run contiguous with the solar array. Excluding any additions to the gravel road, what they have calculated is approximately 850 square feet of impervious surface added to the 8-acre parcel. Even if you round up to 1000 square feet, it is still less than ½ % of impervious surface added to that 8-acre parcel. Another question that was brought up has to do with glare. The modules themselves are engineered to absorb light, they are dark in color and they include a coating to harvest and yield the most energy from the sun’s rays. The modules themselves are less reflective than glass used in residential applications and around the array there is less than a ½” strip of brushed aluminum surface that also is not reflective in nature. The technology itself is built and designed to absorb sunlight vs. reflect sunlight. D. Carr states that one comment that was brought up by J. Jayco was that they were the ones who were going to be the most impacted visually and he believes that J. Jayco is correct. D. Carr indicates on the map where J. Jayco’s

July 9, 2013

house is located and the concern for a view out a second story window. They tried to simulate what that view would be without going on to J. Jayco's property. He explains the process they used to reach the point where they calculated that his second story window was about 25' higher than the ground elevation of the point at a certain point on the solar array. Using geometry they calculated back to the point and took an additional photo. He states that he can give the Board a copy of the "cookbook" that the engineer used. He explains the photos and states that the actual viewing point is twice the distance of where the photo is taken from. He states that he is going to provide copies of the photos for the Board. M. Parillo states that a request was made to visit a local site. He states that Dynamic does not have any sites that are local to Greenfield and sites that are representative. He understands that there was site visited in Pownal, Vermont and there are two issues with that – it was not a Dynamic site and it wasn't necessarily representative of the proposed site in Greenfield primarily because the modules at the Vermont location were stacked too high. He states that he can provide information on additional sites. They picked three sites that were representative of some of the questions, concerns and issues that have been raised. One site in Massachusetts is within 500-feet of a residential development; a site in New Jersey that they built for Aquawater, which is a water utility, approximately 250' upslope from their drinking water reservoir; and a site in Pennsylvania that sits along the Pennsylvania turnpike on a south facing slope facing the turnpike and the reason why this is a good representation is that it is in an area where glare is of the utmost importance and concern as it is sitting 600' back from the turnpike and there are no glare issues at that location. He states that some other questions that came up about why solar. At the State level and Federal level, there is a push for different types of alternative energy; renewable energy in particular, distributed generation. Distributed generation meaning that you are producing power close to a user. You don't have the need for large centralized facilities and transmission lines, you are getting away from the burning of fossil fuels, eliminating the need to dam further rivers, reducing the need for fracking, it's just another alternative to add to the energy mix. It helps to decrease the carbon footprint. It is akin to taking 383 cars off the road, burning 4200 barrels of oil and, as a correction from the application, the array itself is enough to power 280 homes. He believes that the application said 2600 homes. After the installation you have electricity being generated from a system that is relatively low maintenance and using fuel from an unlimited commodity, being the sun. Community benefits was one of the issues that was raised, and S. Ferradino states wouldn't it be nice that all of our development projects had community benefits, it would be nice but is certainly not something that is required. She states that the community benefits of this project, directly, within a very short period of time would be sales tax generation of \$65,000. That obviously goes to the County with a portion being allocated to the Town. Use of local contractors, they think that they have about ½-million dollars worth of work for local contractors to do for work that is not specialized to the solar. That would be electricians, people to do site work, people to do excavation, fencing and landscaping. Specialized work would be required for some portions of the solar installation and those people who have to come here would have to live here for a period of time in order to do the install so they would be staying in local hotels, eating in local restaurants, etc. The other benefit is that this project does not have any regular, routine use of Town services. It is not like a subdivision where you are going to have more significant need for town services such as road maintenance, provisions for schools, emergency services, etc. They will have a discussion with the fire department to make sure that there is adequate protection for the site but there is no routine drain on the municipal services for a project like this. S. Ferradino states that in some municipalities, the municipalities are regularly purchasing vacant property in order to stop development in order to keep their costs for services lower. She states that here we have a college doing it for the town and a pledge that the solar array will not grow any larger and the rest of the uses on this site are primarily for recreational purposes. You have kind of the same impact without the outlay of expense for 120 acres. The last issue that they wanted to address was alternate solar array locations. S. Ferradino states that this is an issue that the College studied at length before selecting this site. They looked at the financial costs and benefits related to location in different places and looked at the impacts of the land. It is certainly true that Skidmore has a fair amount of acreage, around 1000 acres, but most people don't know that most of that land is constrained by either wetlands or steep slopes. So that is not 1000 acres of useful land. After studying several different locations they found that this was the absolute best of the sites to locate this. She states that the original site proposed is the preferred site, the western side of the property. They made the decision to relocate this to the eastern side, at an additional cost of a quarter

July 9, 2013

million dollars, because the neighbor's requested that it be moved. The new site is not quite as favorable for Skidmore; it is not quite as favorable for the neighbors when you talk about visual impacts. They are better able to screen it at the original site because it is more compact and easier to screen something that is visually close to you vs. at a distance. This also raises the issue of the Putnam Brook. Those issues don't exist if they use the original site. They would be very happy to go back to the original site and if the Board directs them to do that, they certainly will and think that it would have less impact overall. She states that they have a NYSERDA grant and that grant has a pretty tight timeframe and it was granted on the first round based upon NYS wanting projects that were kind of ready to go and could be implemented fairly quickly. A change in the location may cause the College to lose the grant, because this is the first round there are not a lot of clear rules and they are not sure if they would even be eligible for the grant if they shifted off this 120 acre site. National Grid also needs to do a fair amount of homework resulting in about 3 months of work for the engineering in order to figure out how a new project like this connects into their existing power supply. She states that they are 2 months into that project, they have another month to go. Switching the site would start that timeframe over. They believe that this is the preferred site; they are comfortable if the neighbors want them to shift it to the presently proposed site and they would be very willing to reconsider moving it back to the original location. C. Baker asks if they have a summary of the process of site selection that they went through. S. Ferradino states that she does not believe that they have anything in writing but they could prepare something. C. Baker asks that they just document the other sites that they looked at and the reasons why they decided not to locate in those sites. S. Weeks states that every once in a while he tries to compare this to the wind turbines because the Town did go through that with wind turbines. When the committee visited the site near Booneville that has 195 of them going, one of the big appeals to the town and the land owners was the rental that the land owners were getting for 1-megawatt turbine which is around \$8,000 a year, he is pretty sure, and the pilot, payment in lieu of taxes that the town was getting, which was about \$8,000 per unit. When he thinks about power production, he keeps thinking about that and what is really in it for the Town of Greenfield compared to wind turbines and it doesn't look like there is a whole lot. B. Duffney questions the life span of the panels. M. Parillo states that the life span of the panels can be in the 30 to 40 year range. There are solar modules that are out there that have been and continue to function for 50 years. He states that the panels do degrade over time, but that levels out and they will continue to function. There is value to these panels beyond the useful life of this project. B. Duffney asks how long before you may have to start replacing them. Do they break down? M. Parillo states that in addition to the low maintenance aspect of the solar, is the continuous, predictable output of the solar modules. The benefit is that they don't break down and they don't need to be replaced. B. Duffney asks about the decibels. M. Parillo states that the conversation that they are having now, generalizing, is at about 60 decibels. B. Duffney questions the test done for the temperature of the water and how far away from the module was the test conducted. M. Parillo states that it was a 5' trench. B. Duffney states that during the site walk he did take a good look at the cars and the side of the streambed. He agrees with what DEC told them that if they pulled the cars out without using a crane to bring them straight up, there would be erosion to the streambed. He asks why it would cost more to move the solar array closer to the power source. D. Carr states that from a site standpoint, and he is not sure of the trenching cost, the trenching would be longer, but from a site standpoint there is almost no clearing associated with the western site. From his standpoint, the cost would be mainly with site clearing, which is going to be a significant number. The road is longer; it is a 12' wide gravel road on fabric. G. Boyer states that moving it over to the east, they cannot trench directly to the inverter, and he indicates on the plans where it would be located. By putting the array in the current configuration, there is a considerable amount more fencing. Originally the fence was going to be almost perfectly square. This arrangement has many more corners and every time you make a turn it costs more. G. Boyer states that a lot of the additional cost is in the site work. They have to remove trees and take ground cover off. T. Yasenchak asks if there is a reason that the fence is jogged and not just a diagonal. D. Carr states that they pushed it over as far as they could and he indicates how the undulations of the fence sort of follow the buffer. There is less site disturbance; every one of the little corners gets you a little farther away. He states that you could save some money running it diagonally but you are probably disturbing a little more than you have to. They did go over this with DEC and they are not touching anything in that buffer, they are not cutting any trees, any brush, etc. S. Ferradino states that there is also the cost to relocate the polo field.

July 9, 2013

If they kept the site on the western side, they would not have any impact on the existing polo practice fields. She indicates where the new array location encroaches on the polo field and they have to shift them. B. Duffney states that when he walked along the stream, he came upon a natural swale type thing and there is quite a bit of a washout. D. Carr states that there are two and indicates their locations on the plan. B. Duffney states that it is pretty level in there, but if the water did go towards the stream it is going to catch that, take it right down and it's possible it would wash it out a little more. He suggests maybe extending the swale. Regarding traffic, B. Duffney states that on Saturday he took a ride by this property. There were people walking down the road from the area where the Board had parked. They were parking in the same area and walking towards polo. There were quite a few people. D. Carr states that there was a Lacrosse tournament at the Polo fields. B. Duffney asks if that is something that will continue. D. Carr states that he cannot speak for Skidmore, but he believes they have to talk to Polo. The tournament was on the Polo fields, why those people were parking at the Skidmore property he does not know. That area has been chained off, but maybe Skidmore needs to talk to Polo about it. B. Duffney states that there were quite a few people. A. McKnight states that the applicant has done a whole lot of homework and done an outstanding job in answering the Board's questions. He is an industrial electrician and 2 megawatts is not normally a dry transformer, it is generally an oil filled transformer. He asks if they are doing something different here. M. Parillo states that he can get the spec sheet for the transformer that they will be using. A. McKnight states that that will include maybe 100 gallons of cooling oil in it so it is something to consider. He states that in addressing the industrial question, why would we not say that electricity in bulk is not a commodity - industrially generated commodity. 2 megawatts is a pretty big site. He states that 1-megawatt would be for a wind turbine, so he would consider this somewhat industrial. The zoning in the area is medium density residential and we are putting, what in his estimation is, an industrial site. S. Ferradino states that she does not feel that it fits within the Town's definition of light industrial. The Town does not have a better definition of what this fits into. She does not think that it is appropriately categorized as an industrial use. T. Yasenchak questions that they do not think that it is a commodity that is being traded. Skidmore is receiving something from it. A. McKnight states that it is sold as a commodity. T. Yasenchak asks if S. Ferradino respectfully disagrees. S. Ferradino states that she disagrees with the analysis, but it is the Board's decision to make. She states that obviously a PUD is a creation of zoning for whatever uses are utilized on the site. This is located 3 lots from a site that is zoned for industrial so it is not that they are planted in an area that doesn't have industrial in close proximity. A. McKnight states that as the residents said last time, they bought their property on the idea that everything around them would be medium density residential and not, in his estimation, industrial in the middle of medium density residential. J. Streit states that philosophically, he was on the committee when they wrote the Comprehensive Plan as was T. Siragusa, and he thinks that one of the things that was most prominent, in the philosophical vein, was to maintain the agricultural nature of this area. As he mentioned at the last meeting, he does not think that it is too much of a stretch to view this as more of agriculture, in his own opinion, than industrial. He thinks that if this were a coal-burning turbine, he would consider that industrial. This is just collecting the sun's rays and converting it into a substance that people use. He sees this as an agricultural capturing of the sun's rays to make something that is useful and used by humans much as food, wheat, etc. There is no sound, there is no smoke, there is no pollution – just addressing those narrow issues that would make it in his mind more industrial than agricultural. J. Streit states that the applicant has met a degree of diligence in answering the questions that were raised, that still does not negate the need for an Environmental Impact Study, by an independent group, that would, if what they report is true, just confirm what the studies today indicate. The two major areas of concern being, one, the impact of the temperature of the water on this trout stream. It seems that this has actually cooled the land instead of heating it. The other thing is to satisfactorily address the visual pollution to the landowners to the west. He feels that they have addressed those tonight, but just to put it in an official document. S. Ferradino thinks that one of the issues was addressed because she believes that the DEC weighed in on the issue of the temperature with the stream. D. Carr states that the DEC letter states that they have no opinion on the temperature and no concern as to the impact to the stream because everything that the applicant is doing is outside the buffer. J. Streit states that if he understands the study, you have a hot glass panel over hot dirt and when the rainwater hits the panel it cools the panel and that cooled water hits the ground and it is actually at a lower temperature than the soil. The study, if accurate, would tend to indicate that the rain

July 9, 2013

would actually cool the land and you would have cooler water running into the stream. M. Parillo states that he will provide a copy of the test. S. Ferradino asks a point of clarification, is it possible to get studies done that would satisfy the Board without going through a 6 month to two-year process of an Environmental Impact Statement. She states that the EIS is a very formal process that requires very measured steps. She states that if they had been asked for a traffic study on a regular project it would just get done. J. Streit states that if the applicant were to provide documentation of what was presented tonight, then it would be up to the judgment of the Board whether they met the issues raised. He states that T. Mina has built a very attractive property and that is an addition to Greenfield. He has maintained it very well and added to Greenfield by the presentation of his property, his concerns are appropriate and his concerns about the possible negative impact, and he thinks he is doing the service of this Board and the Town also to maintain the beauty of Denton Road. It is a very pretty agricultural type of open fields and in his opinion, so far, this would not negatively impact. He thinks that T. Mina is to be applauded for his citizenship concern. We may or may not agree with his objections, but he has valid points that he raises and they should be either mitigated or approached. T. Yasenachak states that when we do the SEQRA, we will be addressing all those particular items and asking the applicant to mitigate them or to show how they can be mitigated. A. McKnight asks if the applicant still intends to have the trees that were proposed along the proposed roadway. D. Carr states that yes they are still planned. T. Siragusa states that he feels that the most important thing is how this is actually classified. He does not know that he can stretch to the solar being agricultural, but it is the same type of process so he sees the thinking. He states that you are creating something and then selling it, so how do you see that, what is your reasoning for not wanting to classify that as commercial or light industrial? S. Ferradino states that when you think of commercial or industrial use, you are thinking of large factories, you are thinking of things like the Pompa quarry and the plant there, you are thinking of warehouse buildings that are having an impact on the neighborhood, nano-tech projects. She does not think of something passively sitting in a field as industrial. T. Siragusa states that a lemonade stand would be very low impact but it would still be commercial. He asks what is the reasoning for her to make a stand to classify it as neither commercial nor light industry. S. Ferradino states that she does not think it fits in with the Town's definition, reviewing the legal terms and the definition just didn't appear to fit. She states that is how she is interpreting it. T. Siragusa asks why. S. Ferradino states because there is a perception with industrial that the use is impactful. T. Siragusa states as far as commercial use this would be extremely low impact. There is no heavy machinery, there is no moving, there is very little traffic – just talking about the solar and not the ball field. He states that she is right; there are little or no Town services involved. It is pretty low impact so he is wondering why not just go and say it is very low impact commercial. It is commercial – you make money off of it. S. Ferradino states that it really doesn't matter how she characterizes it. It is how the Board feels about it and whether the Board thinks that the use is appropriate, whether they consider it agricultural, commercial, industrial – it doesn't matter because you are creating zoning and you are creating zoning with a multiple of uses at the site. Solar is one of those uses. T. Yasenachak states that what some of her colleagues may be asking and the reason why is that they may feel different, but if the applicant had a good reason that could be explained then maybe it may open their eyes to thinking in a different way. J. Streit states that to address T. Siragusa's question, one of the points raised in the Skidmore letter is that they are creating electricity and they are turning it over to the grid, in essence selling it to National Grid, but they are also getting a credit. He states that if they make \$100,000 worth of electricity, they are not adding \$100,000 to their asset line; they are reducing \$100,000 from their liability line. S. Ferradino states that we could argue the semantics all night. The PUD is creating its own zoning so if the Board wants to call it commercial and feels more comfortable calling it commercial, let's call it commercial. She states that quite frankly the PUD calls it solar, a solar facility. T. Siragusa questions that the noise test said 55 decibels at 15-feet. He states that the neighbors say that you can hear someone speaking, which is 60 decibels, at night across the field because it travels. He states that he would like to see if you can hear this at 1500-feet at all. S. Ferradino states that they are capable of getting an expert who can say 65 decibels at 1500-feet equals whatever because there is a mathematical formula that can be used. D. Carr states that it is not that simple. There is a formula but it is very difficult to do. You probably actually have to go out into the field and do it because the formula has so many variables – wind direction, wind speed, etc. M. Parillo states that at night when they are not producing any electricity, the inverters shut down. T. Siragusa asks why they changed the plan to say

July 9, 2013

that they will mitigate if no lower than 65 decibels at the nearest receptor site, if it is only 55 decibels. S. Ferradino states that they were so confident that it would not be heard that they thought that putting in mitigation measures, which is something specifically a neighbor requested both in his letter and his testimony, he asked specifically for a provision in the PUD, and as they have done with many of his other requests, they made the change. She states that 65 is the standard used by DEC for ambient noise in a non-industrial area. If it were an industrial area it would be 75. T. Siragusa states that he was thinking 50. He understands the confidence vs. what is standard. T. Yasenchak states that the applicant has done an excellent job of bringing the Board the information regarding the solar array and all the potential impacts, and we will be getting into that when we get into the SEQRA. She states that the applicant has stated over and over again that the primary use is going to be recreation, so she wants to get into that in a little more depth and definitions, because we are looking at the impact of the whole site and not just the impact of the solar. She thinks that the applicant has brought enough information about the existing ball field, what the solar maintenance is going to be as far as traffic, but if they could get into a little bit more about the definitions that are listed in the PUD, what those specifically mean and the extent to which those will be developed on the property. When they say equestrian, we don't necessarily have equestrian listed in the Zoning Code. Does that mean they will have stables or that they could have stables, or does it just mean that you are going to ride horses on the property? Would there be an exercise/hot-walking ring? What does equestrian mean as far as the impact on the neighborhood? When they get into Polo and Polo related activities, exactly what does that mean? T. Yasenchak states that she knows that what they do now is just practicing, but she thinks that if that is part of the PUD she would like that defined as far as whether they intend to ever have matches there, do they have practice matches and if they do what are the bathroom facilities for that? That was addressed very well for the ball field, but what happens on the polo field? T. Mina had mentioned at the last meeting that there are other events that happen. S. Ferradino mentioned tonight that there is a Frisbee tournament that happens. That is definitely an impact on the neighborhood. Does it happen just once, does the PUD limit those to a certain number of tournaments a year, or is that something that could potentially happen every single weekend? If so, what is the impact on traffic? She states that S. Ferradino did mention that the traffic study was not important. Maybe it is not important when you look at the existing use of the ball field and the solar array, but when you look at the rest of the PUD uses, T. Yasenchak thinks that they may find that they generate more traffic. They could prove through a traffic study that they are not going to. The PUD states recreational facilities including specifically the ball field, but it doesn't necessarily state that they are not going to have any other type of field. S. Ferradino stated that the baseball fields were going to be used by Skidmore for a certain period of time, however, then she mentioned it being used for some league play. T. Yasenchak states that it was mentioned as a community benefit and she agrees, but how often does that happen? Are they only there for a weekend or two, but would that increase the possibility of having Little Leaguers there every single weekend? The same thing with the rest of the fields, would there be soccer tournaments? What is the extent of the recreational facilities and how does that impact the neighborhood as a PUD. S. Ferradino states that her sense is that she could answer these questions simply by making a modification to the PUD which required Skidmore to get either Site Plan Review or Special Use Permit in advance of expanding any of the existing uses. That way the Board would have an opportunity on a case-by-case basis address whether those uses would be in fitting with the neighborhood. T. Yasenchak states that when listing that use within the PUD, when we look at the site plan we are only looking to make sure that they meet the requirements for parking. She states that she is looking at the use of the site. S. Ferradino states that she is looking at it from the procedural aspect that they are creating a zone. The different zones have specific uses in them, but some of them are subject to site plan, some to both site plan and special use permit. That allows you to do a case-by-case analysis. If they say they want to put a lacrosse field in, they can look at that and review it. T. Yasenchak states that is where we differ, that is not necessarily site plan, it is PUD use. If the Board approves recreational facilities, they cannot necessarily later say that the applicant can't use it that way. S. Ferradino states that T. Yasenchak might want to check with Mark Schachner on that. T. Yasenchak comments on 'polo related activities', she does not know what that is. S. Ferradino states that is in the Polo PUD currently. T. Yasenchak states that it is not defined in this PUD – equestrian, polo and polo related activities, recreational facilities - what those will include. She states that when you look at the Town's definition of recreational facilities, it is very broad. Regarding the industrial and commercial

July 9, 2013

uses, our definition for commercial use does say, 'any use involving the sale, rental or distribution of goods or commodities, either retail or wholesale, or the provision of recreation facilities or activities for a fee or as otherwise defined by this chapter.' She states that it really is how each of the Board as individuals, when continuing in this review process, interprets what the code means and how that is relevant to the Comprehensive Plan. She states that she would assume that Polo does not use the fields for free, that there is a lease. Mike Hall, Skidmore, states that there is a modest lease cost. T. Yasenchak questions that when the other leagues play, do they lease the space or is it a community benefit that they are just being allowed to play for free. She states that the Board has required, for other PUDs, of the applicants to actually state their limits of use. For instance, for another PUD they were asked to specify how many large events or catering events they were going to have per year. That helps the Board to evaluate properly the impact on the neighborhood. She states that as to the no parking signs on the road, she does not know that that is something she would consider mitigation. Greenfield is only on one half of the road, so we cannot put signs on the other half of the road. T. Yasenchak states that if the applicant is going to continue to say that the primary use of the PUD is recreational, she would like to see a little more on that rather than just those line items because she feels that that impacts the neighborhood. J. Streit states that in answer to one of T. Yasenchak's questions, he thinks that not everything can be anticipated in writing legislation and PUD language. We have to do the best we can. S. Ferradino's suggestion that perhaps each additional use to what is spelled out could be addressed on a case-by-case basis, that would protect the concerns for the Town. T. Yasenchak states that she will ask the Town Attorney, but she respectfully disagrees because if we are going to look at a use she thinks that impacts a neighborhood. If they are going to have a Frisbee tournament there that has 100 people every single weekend, that is different than polo being there practicing a few times a week. J. Streit state that he agrees.

Public hearing is reopened at 9:28 p.m. Fred McNeary, Daniels Road and Prestwick Chase, asks if anyone on the Board happened down Denton Road over the weekend, Saturday or Sunday. He knows that B. Duffney stated that he had. He states that he is a firm believer that government is to help people in ways that they cannot help themselves. This past weekend when there was a tournament going on at Polo, and they were using the Skidmore premises for parking, there was a very unsafe situation. He states that he has a video on his cell phone and does not know if that is permissible or not. He would like to show it to the Board and asks that it be taken into consideration while looking at the entire area and how it impacts the neighborhood. There were people on the corner of Bloomfield and Denton Road directing traffic whether it be to the Polo Field or down the street where they had school buses transporting people to the Polo Fields. They were not hired professionals they were just people out in the street with tee shirts on. With the amount of people walking down Denton Road, it made it a very unsafe situation. He wishes that something could be addressed about this. This happens a couple times a year, whether it be a Skidmore activity or a Polo activity. What ends up happening is the intersection, the corner of Bloomfield Road and Denton Road, becomes a staging area for whatever event is going on, and sometimes it is in coordination between the two. He thinks that needs to be stopped or at least it needs to be addressed. He thinks that anything can be accomplished if it is worked through properly. T. Yasenchak asks if the video is something that can be downloaded and sent to the Planning Board. F. McNeary states that he will do that. J. Streit asks if it is F. McNeary's point that this is a Skidmore property generated problem or a Polo problem. F. McNeary states that this is throughout the year, not often - monthly, every two months, maybe a couple times a week in the summer - it becomes a combined effort. Whether it be a large gathering having lacrosse played on the Polo field and also on the Skidmore fields. He believes that on Sunday there was some sort of a shoot-out on the Skidmore fields behind T. Mina's, the practice polo fields. He would just like it to be addressed, it is a traffic issue. He states that T. Yasenchak had mentioned in her comments that she has traversed that road and his senior citizens are traversing that road. He states that there were sport utility vehicles on the road, not just foot traffic, which was sizeable, but transportation back and forth for a large gathering. Bob Hyndman, Denton Road, states that he has been out of the country for a couple of weeks and between the time that he left and now coming back and picking up again on this project so much has changed that he hopes he is not going over ground that has been gone over before. When he left this was somewhere between an 8 and 18 acre project that had just been moved across the way and now it is a 120 acre PUD, and now it is everything

July 9, 2013

– sports, parking, everything. He states that he has been through some pretty big PUDs for the Denton Road area over the years so he is not unfamiliar with the process. He states that if he hadn't gone through this before, he would have been lost because one minute we are talking about an athletic facility, another moment we are talking about light industrial or whether it is recreational or it's eco-storage, he does not know what it is but there are 18 acres of it there. As far as he is concerned it is industrial. He states that he guesses that the Board is not doing the long form SEQRA or hasn't started it yet. T. Yasenchak states that the Board has not gotten there yet because they felt that they needed additional information. B. Hyndman states that in going through this with Skidmore before, everything is last minute, we have to rush it through because there is a tight deadline based on financial funding. He states that at the time, he offered that they could do the athletic fields on their property, he was told that it wouldn't work and now that is where they are. He states that he does not know how we can go forward without the long form SEQRA. We also need to ask with all the events that have been going on there, and he refers to F. McNeary's video, this is not uncommon for the neighborhood. In conversation with Town officials, he has asked on several occasions before he went away, before he knew that the project was going to become this 120 acre mixed use, how many times has Skidmore come to the Town for a permit for use. He knows that they rent out to softball or baseball teams in the summer for use, that is the biggest use, the summertime, that is when the traffic is the highest. The response from Town officials was never. To their knowledge they have never asked for a permit or paid a fee for these additional events. He states that they have to be generating revenue, and the revenue between Polo and Skidmore is not insignificant. The Town sees absolutely no revenue from that. He does not know where the \$65,000 in sales tax revenue comes from. He states that when the windmills came to town, they had fixed numbers, somewhere between \$25,000 and \$50,000 per year. The numbers were significant and we were willing to look at it. He states that when a project starts out in the paper at 3 –4 acres and then it comes in at 8 acres and now it is 18 acres and it is just blossoming. Every time it is presented it doubles in size and now it is 120 acres. What is it going to be next week, what is going to be brought to the Board? When it went to the Town Council he was not particularly opposed to it, he had mixed feelings. People should be able to do what they want with their property. He states that he was at the Town meetings when we revamped the zoning. This section, this area - the Locust Grove, Denton Road, Bloomfield, Daniels Road, a little bit into Braim Road - was hotly contested as to the zoning. The area is residential and whether it should be 1 to 1 ½ acres, whether it should go back to 5 acres. Greenfield is in the business of families. We are a residential community and the tax base was coming out of this general area and that's why they are all assessed at a higher rate because it is a more desirable location in proximity to Saratoga Springs. This project does anything but help it. If Polo ever gets around to building the luxury homes across the street, he does not know that this will be a selling point for them. He cannot imagine that it is going to help them. He states that he knows there is a lot of pressure to proceed as quickly as possible, we have been down this road before with Skidmore College, he thinks it behooves us to go forward cautiously and not offer up or sign paper on such a broad and sweeping PUD that the people who live in that neighborhood wind up paying the price. There being no additional public comments, this public hearing is adjourned at 9:42 p.m.

T. Yasenchak states that, for the record, we have been going through this process, we do have a long form that we have just not gotten to yet because in order for the Board to review it in an effective manner, we need to receive all this information so that we can answer the questions appropriately. She agrees with B. Hyndman that this is important and we will be getting to it because it is part of the process. S. Weeks states that his daughter was at the lacrosse game and she did say it was a mess. He knows that Polo has had one other event that he happened to drive by that was pretty overloaded and out onto the street. He is concerned about that. B. Duffney reiterates that he did see it also, F. McNeary's residents are driving through and we don't know whether some of them are such good drivers. B. Hyndman states that W. Barss had put up signs about not parking in the road there, but he does not know where they are now. B. Duffney provides the Board with information on a couple of solar farms in Vermont. This will be copied for the Board. T. Yasenchak asks the Board to review everything and that at the next meeting we will probably have either Mike Hill or Mark Schachner present as we continue with the SEQRA, which is a very detailed document, that we can make sure that we do it correctly. She asks the Board to look that over and think about that document. S. Weeks asks if we have to do the SEQRA before doing the referral. T. Yasenchak states that

July 9, 2013

we do because we are giving an opinion on how we feel that this will impact the neighborhood and in order to do that we need to do the environmental assessment. Even if at that point we feel that we need additional information after doing that or if they have to do an EIS, that is the process that it goes through and that is why we will have the attorney here to make sure that we are following the right process because if we ask them for more things after the long form, we would need additional review time.

The meeting is adjourned at 9:48 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary