

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD**

**PLANNING BOARD**

**April 8, 2014**

**REGULAR MEETING**

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by John Streit at 7:00 p.m. On roll call, the following members are present: Nathan Duffney, Andrew McKnight, Thomas Siragusa, John Streit, Stan Weeks and John Bokus, Alternate. Tonya Yasenchak and Michael Gyarmathy are absent. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer and Mike Hill, Town Attorney, are present.

---

**MINUTES – March 25, 2014**

MOTION: A. McKnight

SECOND: S. Weeks

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of March 25, 2014, as submitted.

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

Noes: None

Absent: Gyarmathy, Yasenchak

---

**MULLEYVILLE SNOWMOBILE CLUB – Site Plan Review**

Ormsbee Road, Rear

Steve Archer is present for this application and explains that the club would like to build a 40 x 60 pole barn on their property on Ormsbee Road for grooming equipment storage. A public hearing is opened at 7:03 p.m. Brad Dutcher, Ormsbee Road, states that this is a private road and that is their main concern. It is not a public road with public access. His attorney sent a letter to the Town's attorney regarding this matter so it needs to be addressed before the Planning Board goes any further. Gerry Feulner, Ormsbee Road, states that he has a concern about the road and the use of their property. J. Streit asks how he thinks his property might be affected by this and what the concerns are. G. Feulner states that it is only a one lane road and there have been several accidents on the road including this year when he had a young 18 year old dying on his front yard and they couldn't get an ambulance to them. They had to use an off-road machine to get to the kid. They managed to save his life, but it was on G. Feulner's property. He just feels that it is not a good place for a 600 member snowmobile club. Tim Webb, Ormsbee Road, states that it is fair to say that for years, as property owners, most of them and some more so than others, have supported the snowmobile club. Whether that be allowing them to use their land for trails or supporting them in a monetary way. They come here tonight a bit concerned as property owners on Ormsbee Road, which as has been stated it is a private road, not only for the road condition, and G. Feulner does a good job keeping it in shape and whose efforts they all support, but more importantly the liability that is involved in allowing the membership access thru their property to the end to the gate to access their property. He states that he does not know of any legal means that doesn't say that the property owners, if there happens to be an incident, they are responsible, they are liable. In the winter that is not as big an issue because New York State has been kind enough to provide the snowmobile clubs with liability insurance and hold the landowners harmless. That is a limited insurance policy, he believes. The property owners are concerned with the liability with the increase in traffic coming up and down the road, as well as the condition of the road, which as landowners, they work hard to keep up and safe. J. Streit asks who is the last landowner before the Mulleyville property. It is stated that Darren Murtlow's

April 8, 2014

property is the nearest to Mulleyville. D. Murtlow states that he does not approve of this request. Vickie Feulner, Ormsbee Road, states that her major concern is with the road, but also, once the barn is there, who is going to make sure who is allowed in and out of it. Once you are there, you do whatever you want – parties, etc. Who is going to take care of that? For 16 years her husband has been taking care of the road, mostly on their dime. Some of the land owners do give them money for gas or whatnot. Lou & Brad Dutcher give them things to help maintain the road, but the snowmobile club, for 5 years, has never offered. They are not very good neighbors. She states that they approached the Board a few years ago about having the Town help with the road, take care of the road, they pay taxes on the road and they were told that “it will never happen in our time” and they “need to get better neighbors” above us. J. Streit asks if it was this Board. R. Rowland states she believes it was the Town Board. J. Streit states that this is not an issue that would have come to the Planning Board. V. Feulner states that it is like the Town is dumping the problems on the landowners. When everyone goes home at night, it’s their problem, not anyone else’s. J. Streit states that he thinks that the Planning Board would have difficulty taking action on this tonight, because there is a legal issue involving the road, which has to be resolved. The public hearing is adjourned at this time. S. Archer states that this is the first time he is hearing about this since they purchased the land. He states that they have not been in communication with any of these landowners about this issue for about 3 or 4 years. They have talked with them, they have not heard these concerns before, and so he states that he would like to address it with the neighbors at some point before the next meeting so that they can work on this. When they purchased the land they went thru this whole question and answer system, and the snowmobile club produced a letter stating that this land would be used only for storage and maintenance of the equipment. They thought that they had addressed these concerns. J. Streit states that it sounds like we have come to an impasse and there is a legal issue where the ownership of the road has to be established and therefore we will not be able to take any additional action tonight. He states that the statement made by the applicant is very meaningful, we lack communication here. We are all from Greenfield, we all want to respect each other’s properties, we all want everyone to enjoy what Greenfield has to offer as much as possible and this is much better if we can work out some things before we come to the meeting. It sounds like we have all genuine, sincere people who should be able to work something out and come to an understanding before we take this up again. M. Hill states that the applicant is before the Zoning Board for an area variance as well as the Planning Board. This should be sent to the Saratoga County Planning Board for a referral since the property is within 500’ of the Town of Corinth. M. Hill asks if we know when the Saratoga County Planning Board meets. R. Rowland states that she believes it is the third Thursday. J. Streit questions that they would be able to get a referral back to the Town by April 29<sup>th</sup> so the earliest we could schedule this would be May 13<sup>th</sup>, which would also be after the next Zoning Board meeting. M. Hill states that the Planning Board indicated at the last meeting that they would not take action until the ZBA addressed the variance issue. He states that it looks like May 13<sup>th</sup> would be the next opportunity for this Board to address this. J. Streit addresses the applicant regarding this timeline. M. Hill states then that the applicant will be back on the May 13<sup>th</sup> agenda and based on the comments that were made tonight and the letter received from the attorney representing Mr. Dutcher, which calls into question whether or not the snowmobile club has any right of access to its parcel. He thinks that the Board would be looking for the applicant to submit some evidence that they have legal access to their parcel. It would be important for the applicant to get whatever information that they have to the Planning Board.

---

**PRESTWICK CHASE – PUD Amendment & Country Squire Green Space Amendment**  
Denton Road

Luigi Palleschi is present and presents the amendment to the Country Squire Estates green space. He reviews that Country Squire was approved as a cluster subdivision with a 25.5 acre green space parcel. The proposal is to reconfigure the green space, keeping the same amount of acreage. He states the 25.5 acre green space also allowed a 9-hole golf course, which would allow the applicant as part of his PUD project to clear cut within that acreage. With the current proposal they are agreeing to a no-cut within that

April 8, 2014

green space. He explains the buffering that is to take place along Daniels Road. J. Streit asks L. Palleschi to explain the reasoning behind the switching of the location of the 7.5 acres. L. Palleschi explains the amendment that they are requesting to the existing Prestwick Chase PUD. He explains the reasoning behind the connection to Daniels Road, that they have done a traffic study and it is anticipated that only about 25% of the residents of Prestwick Chase will use that exit. He states that this is and will continue to be a private road with a gate at the Denton Road entrance and a proposed gate at Daniels. He explains the units to be built in the area near the Daniels Road entrance, the change from 3 to 2 stories and the 75' buffer.

A public hearing is opened at 7:23 p.m. Darren Tracy, Daniels Road, states that he is at a little of a disadvantage because he has not been following this issue, it just came to his attention recently. He states that one main concern he has is that Daniels Road is really busy and this project appears that it will make it even that much busier. He does not see any improvements to Daniels Road associated with this so he would like the Board to consider that. He has a problem with the change of the set aside green space to the original Country Squire subdivision. He states that it seems like it is a bait and switch tactic. That project was approved based upon a certain parcel being set aside. If a property owner has a project that can be built within the rules and regulations, and it makes the neighborhood denser and the streets a little more crowded, then so be it. If the rules have to be changed in order to do that, he has an issue with that and the Board should consider that strongly. A. McKnight asks if D. Tracy lives in one of the houses surrounding the PUD. D. Tracy states that he lives about 3/10ths of a mile to the east. Jim Ash, Daniels Road, states that he agrees with the gentleman before him that when something is approved and a promise made, a promise is kept. Just below the proposed green space is a sharp "S" curve and he has seen several accidents on that corner, especially in the winter, with no exiting traffic there except for one house. He states that there will be accidents here; it will be a death trap. He lives in the country and pays his taxes in Greenfield because he wanted to live in the country. If he had wanted to live near townhouses and condos he would have moved into Saratoga downtown or Wilton. Justin Grassi, attorney representing Tim and Maureen Laskey, states that the Board has already received a letter signed by several of the residents of Country Squire and along Daniels Road. He provides another copy with an additional signature. He states that it is T. and M. Laskey's opinion that the amendment to the green space is not in keeping with the original intent of the green space. It was intended to be a buffer zone to prevent noise and sight between Prestwick Chase and the residents of Country Squire. Moving the 7.5 acres to the west does not provide the same benefit for Country Squire residents. They are concerned with the hum of the wells and that you can actually see the lights, seasonally anyway. He states that they have heard rumors that during the meetings with the developer and some of the residents, that there is a possibility of the road actually going thru Country Squire. Cathy Paton, Country Squire, states that her house was built 19 years ago. She explains that a lot of promises have been made regarding the golf course, etc., and she is still paying for some of those promises. Daniels Road has changed drastically in the 19 years that they have been there. It was a nice country road and now it is a speedway. She states that she cannot see how a ladder truck, will be able to get in to help any of those senior citizens, make that turn into that development. She is concerned with the water usage, they all have wells. She does not believe that L. Palleschi answered the question as to why the land was swapped. She states that F. McNeary, at a Planning Board meeting, stated that the security gates are never used. She states that they are also concerned about the lighting, the visual. Their quality of life has dropped drastically. The only reason she stays at Country Squire is because of her neighbors. She is also suspicious about a recent sale in the development just shortly before this all came out. She states that F. McNeary's sister just sold her house before Christmas. J. Streit states that would be conjecture. T. Siragusa asks about her comment that she is still paying for promises. C. Payton states that it is just about the way her house was built. She states it is not to do with this particular property except maybe the golf course promise. Not just from F. McNeary, but from his father as well. J. Bokus states that he lives on Daniels Road and believes that part of the increase in traffic is because of the stop light at Route 9, it has nothing to do with anyone's house. C. Payton states that she understands that, her husband is a State Trooper and if he pulls someone over, they are generally not from the area. She states that the reason why the speed limit did not go down is

April 8, 2014

because there is such an influx of traffic on Daniels Road and that means that the amount of accidents is more acceptable to the State of New York. Brian McCandless, states that he has owned property next to F. McNeary for 25 years, actually preceding the McNearys. He has watched this piece of property go thru several changes. He gives a little history. He states that promises were made at the time that this was originally approved by the Planning Board. A PUD is a variance to not include any of the rules that pre-exist it. They used IDA money. He explains the parcels that were originally part of the PUD and Country Squire. He reiterates that there were promises made and categorically broken. The green space was a promise. He indicates that the neighbors do have a right to that. The plans are very intrusive and degrade his property. There is nothing like this in Greenfield and the applicant wants to make it bigger. It is a huge density and it is all because the applicant wants to break another promise. It is not what the PUD was originally envisioned for. Just because you say that you are not going to let kids move in, does not mean it is some special senior housing. He states that his wife is involved in senior housing and this is just a bunch of townhouses crammed in in the middle of Greenfield. If F. McNeary wanted to be nice he would cut new sewer lines, which he has sworn to never do. B. McCandless explains where F. McNeary's house is compared to his property and states that F. McNeary stated that he is going to take B. McCandless' adjacent property by adverse possession and there is nothing that B. McCandless can do to stop it. He states that F. McNeary has knocked down some white pines that were on B. McCandless' property. It clearly degrades this area. One of the things that negates someone else taking away your property is to say in advance that they are going to do it. Rosemary Jensen, Locust Grove Road, explains that she owns the historically significant property, which is the Bed and Breakfast, and gives a little bit of history of the property. All of her guests will be looking out on this. She states that they have wild life sanctuary, at their own costs, and they are going to lose that and it is going to have a devastating effect on their business. She states that it just does not seem right that the applicant can maneuver the map to get this 300 unit monstrosity. She states that there is currently a lot of light pollution, noise pollution and times 3; it is not going to be pretty. Ann Schwartzman, Daniels Road, states that she has concerns about the change, there is a lot of wildlife behind her property and this space would prevent the animals from having access to somewhere to go. She thinks the change in green space would definitely affect that. In reading the February 25<sup>th</sup> minutes, she would like the Board to address the additional 25 acres of green space that she believes may be needed for this project because this was Country Squire green space, not Prestwick Chase green space. Kurt Kolakowski, Country Squire, comments that Country Squire was approved with that green space. He is sure that it could be argued that moving the green space, but eventually you would get to the point where moving green space that was approved originally as part of a cluster subdivision would not be of benefit to the original subdivision, which he thinks is in this case. He feels that maybe this has been segmented a little bit. He knows that the Board has been asked to give an opinion on just the transfer of the green space at this time, but he thinks it does make it a little difficult to work thru what the details of this would be without knowing what likely site plan adjustments would be made to this site. He states it would be helpful to the neighbors to know that if certain changes were made, what other changes would result. It is difficult to ask the Board at this point to make a recommendation without placing other restrictions on there. Part of the green space is a National Grid ROW and he is sure that they have a right to clear cut up to the edge of that. Therefore he feels the process has been segmented a little bit and if they were unable to get this change made, that in practical application, the Town Board in their amendment to the PUD would not approve any development on the south western portion of the property. He states that the only reason this would make sense to him would be that there would be an extra 7 acres for development on this project. He would urge the Planning Board to give a negative recommendation for that. He also has concerns about the safety of Daniels Road. John Kuznia, Country Squire, states that his concerns are about the overall density in this area which is generally supposed to be a pretty rural area and secondly, Daniels Road. This is a dangerous spot. To have any kind of an access road right there, it is a dangerous turn, you have to slow down a lot and you are going to see dense building right there. He thinks it is too close to the road and that originally that green space was designed as a buffer between any kind of development of Daniels Road and Country Squire Court. He thinks we should stick with the original plan, leave that space green space and maybe the applicant can come up with an alternative which is less dense. Eric Chapin, Country Squire, states

April 8, 2014

that this opening to Daniels Road is just an opening for accidents. He has 2 young children who will never see Daniels Road as it is right now. This 300 unit development, as meaningful as it is for senior housing, we still have to keep the community intact and by even entertaining the impact of this, we have to do our diligence. He states that the impact that they are going to see just so that you can have access, a thoroughfare. If you make a street, you make it efficient, you bring speed, you bring accidents – he fears for what is going to happen. It is a nerve wracking thought when you can shuffle the deck because it is convenient and to the benefit of one party. He does not see how we can allow this. He is opposed to the 300 unit development in his backyard, but if this is going to happen, there really needs to be some further feasibility studies to see what this is going to do. He believes we are creating a bad precedent by allowing something like this to even be considered. Paul Bouchard, Denton Road, states that he was hoping that if the road out to Daniels came out there, that maybe the County or the State would put in a stop sign to stop the flow of traffic. Otherwise he agrees that it would be an extreme hazard, but to have a compound of several hundred people without a second access in case of an emergency to get out of that area would just cause an incredible loss of life. He states that a loss of life of people on Daniels is also very important. Bob Torgeson, Revere Lane, states that he has listened to what is going on and the one comment he wants to make is that he has heard many, many objections and many, many excellent points regarding the history of the parcel with regards to the rights of property owners and he thinks that the duty of the Planning Board in any community is to represent the interests of the many, not the one. He has yet to hear what is the one benefit for moving that line and does that balance with all the negative impacts to people who have been living here for 20 years. Tom Lochner, Liberty Drive, states that even now with the trees it is very easy to hear the pumps running and see the lights, but he also has a concern about the expansion of the complex and there being more light pollution and noise in their neighborhood. He states that he has concerns about the traffic in that area and is it going to be absolutely dangerous for his child when he begins to ride a bike to go anywhere near Daniels Road. He states that they have the green space under the National Grid line which really does not provide any buffer between the homes, further, as people were commenting, that is a heavily patrolled area. There are cameras, no trespassing signs, etc. There is no benefit to the community out of the green space. It doesn't provide protection, it doesn't provide any kind of walkway – you can't walk on Daniels anymore and it will only get worse. With the new parcel that is going to be reassigned, he questions the reassignment to the other seven acres. He states it doesn't seem like a very fair trade to cut it down for a new development. He questions what kind of studies have been done on this area that is going to be clear cut – has there been a wetlands assessment, impact to endangered species, etc. D. Tracy states that the only benefit that was suggested by the applicant was that the 20+ acres as re-proposed was not going to be clear cut. Suggesting that the existing set aside area might be potentially clear cut for a golf course and that is just not going to happen, so that proposed benefit doesn't exist because the existing land is not going to be clear cut. J. Ash, states that he does not see any reason to approve this other than for someone to build townhouses. Greenfield is country living and that is why people move to Greenfield and why he invested in his property. This exit will be less than 100 yards from the end of his driveway. He thinks it is wrong to even consider amending something from years ago and breaking a promise to the people who live on Daniels Road. There being no further public comments, this public hearing is adjourned.

J. Streit thanks everyone who came out and spoke so eloquently, giving their opinions and ideas. If the Boards do not have those ideas to work with, they cannot adequately do their jobs. He sees the job of the Planning Board to protect 3 aspects – to protect and serve the applicant, if someone wants to develop something that is possible in Greenfield or build a house, we owe an obligation to them; we owe an obligation to the neighbors who are already there and we are responsible to make sure that they are not negatively affected; and we are also obligated to the Town to protect the Town's interests. L. Palleschi states that he is shocked that for most of the residents this is the first time that they have heard of this project. He states that they have been delayed, worked with – here for about a year on the plan that is presented, 300 additional apartment units. That plan has never changed, it has always been that additional 300 units. We have had public hearings, closed public hearings, reopened public hearings and is shocked that these neighbors weren't aware or did not show up at that time to address their concerns. He states

April 8, 2014

that about 90% of the questions have been addressed. A traffic study was done and there is plenty of capacity on the roads, they are aware of the 'S' curve and that is why they placed the curb cut on Daniels where it is. The original PUD was approved in 1996 and he explains on the plans. He states that they are proposing 4 to 5 units per acre and he does not believe that is high density. He points out the areas of the property that are not to be developed and that they are looking at 50% to 70% green space overall. He explains the inclusion of the property that would buffer the people at the southern end of Locust Grove Road. Light pollution and visual have been looked at from every angle. He reiterates that they have been working with the Town for about a year now and have addressed 90% of the concerns. There is an existing well on the site, he points it out and states that it was built even further away from Country Squire than was originally proposed. The well will not affect any of the wells in the adjoining neighborhood. There is a study that has been done and approved by DOH. He explains that there is a pump station for the sewer that is privately owned and it does discharge into Saratoga County Sewer district. All the roads within the PUD are privately owned and maintained at no cost to the Town. The Town will benefit from tax dollars from this project. He agrees with the comments regarding the National Grid easement and that National Grid has to maintain their ROW, but there is green space on either side of the easement and it is a buffer on its own because no one can do anything within that. They have done a wetland delineation; it has been approved by ACOE and is shown on the map. Speed is being enforced on Daniels Road as well as the tonnage limit. He is aware that the neighbors have put together a petition to the Town Board to lower the speed limit on Daniels Road, although he believes it has been denied. They reduced the height of the buildings behind the bed and breakfast from 3-stories to 2 stories, as well as some at Daniels Road and they are adding additional mature trees. He states that they are amending something, but mitigating those measures. J. Streit asks L. Palleschi about the comment that was brought up about the applicant putting the road through Country Squire Court. L. Palleschi states that he does not know where the neighbor heard that and that he has not heard that. J. Streit states that that would have to come thru the Planning Board and be approved. M. Hill questions that that was never part of a plan. L. Palleschi states that it was not. A. McKnight reiterates that he is opposed to relocating the 7.5 acres. T. Siragusa asks what access was documented to be provided to the residents of Country Squire Estates. L. Palleschi states that to his knowledge, the 25.5 acres existing green space did not allow the residents to use that parcel. That was intended for open space, intended for the golf course. There are a lot of 'envisions' placed on it. T. Siragusa asks if a document can be provided that there is no access, that the access is totally restricted. He is questioning that because he does not see allowing for green space in a cluster type of environment without access or transfer of ownership. He just wants to be clear that there is documentation that the residents of Country Squire were forbidden from accessing that property or did they have any kind of assumption of rights to access that property. L. Palleschi states that he does not know how to answer that. J. Bokus states that there was never a HOA. L. Palleschi states that typically when you do a cluster subdivision you set aside certain acreages, then a HOA takes over that, and then it does allow the residents of that neighborhood to access it. J. Streit states that the concept of a cluster development is that the residents already bought it. T. Siragusa states that L. Palleschi is stating that the original plan for the original PUD for the golf course was to use that green space. He wants to know how that is possible. This problem of using the green space for two different purposes originated with the original PUD, not just with this PUD amendment. D. Pentkowski, attorney representing Prestwick Chase, states that the legislation that is currently in effect allows for this. He does not know whether that was the original approval or not. M. Hill states that he believes that in the 1990's there was an amendment done allowing for part of the green space to be used for a golf course. The Planning Board approved that request. The idea at the time was that the proposed open space use of the golf course would be consistent with a green space designation for the Country Squire Estates green space. T. Siragusa states that he wishes that the public had been here all along. A lot of the statements that came up tonight, including traffic, were addressed to a great extent earlier on and they would have known how those things were calculated, etc. The main issue here is transferring this green space and not the overall project. T. Siragusa states that his opinion is consistent as it has been. There are two things that happen when you deny access to this 25 acres as being part of the PUD. It makes the whole project denser and if you look at it in terms of residents per acre, or whatever the ratio is, it is 25% more dense than it was in the original

April 8, 2014

amended PUD amendment, and he has an issue with that. We are clear that you cannot use this green space, wherever it lies, in two different places. It cannot apply to the Prestwick Chase amended PUD as well as Country Squire Estates at the same time. He states that it is a huge precedent to say that an area that is set aside is no longer set aside for the same purpose. If he looked at an original acceptance by an older Planning Board in terms of a similar use case for a golf course vs. no use whatsoever, he thinks he could see perhaps, but that was not moving it, it was repurposing it. He does not think that argument applies here. He thinks if there is precedent for moving green space from one purpose to another, that opens a huge can of worms for any other time that the Planning Board is asking for the developer to set aside green space. He thinks neighbors would want some assurance that it would remain over time, and he does respect that. T. Siragusa states that he respects the work that has been done on this, he respects that it would be very disruptive to the project, but he thinks that he is against and certainly uncomfortable with adjusting the green space for this purpose. S. Weeks states that to some extent we forced this issue ourselves because we had a lot of discussion about only one road entering this development and we basically said that we thought that the project really needed a road out to Daniels as well. We talked about it being limited in terms of access but we said for emergency vehicles and that sort of issue we really felt that was important. That is sort of what drove us. You can't have the road go out unless you take some of that green space, because you don't have sight distance. He reiterates for the public that we had a lot of discussion about that and that is one of the things that drove the Board to say that we really want another access, we really think we need another one. We don't want everything going out to Daniels but we also recognize that you have to have space along that road in order to have an exit road. He wants to make sure that everyone understands that the Board discussed it repeatedly for this development. The developer did make some real changes in going from 3-story to 2-story buildings, and the Board felt that the 3-story was tough when you get close to homes. Also along Daniels at one point there was only a 50' buffer and it was increased to 75'. S. Weeks states that he believes we are now talking about no-cut, instead of strictly green space. Those are some changes that the Board has had a lot of discussion about and he wanted everyone to be aware of that. B. Duffney states that regarding the two entrances, it was felt that if one entrance was blocked in some way and there is an emergency, there is another exit. He has been at Prestwick Chase and it is a gated community, you have to be buzzed in and out. He states that some of the moving of some of the green space and getting the sight distance, which was a main concern, and we made sure that the applicant covered that. Do we have to move 7.5 acres, maybe not? The Board has tried to take into consideration the neighbors by having the applicant move the setbacks. Lighting was discussed and the applicant proposed different lighting. L. Palleschi confirms this. M. Hill states that for the benefit of the public, on a procedural note, as everyone now knows, Prestwick Chase was seeking a change to their existing PUD and when it became apparent to the Board that the green space that was previously allocated to Country Squire Estates would be affected by the proposed change to the PUD, the Planning Board realized that it would be important for the public to be aware of the proposed change and as a result we have this hearing. He states that the proposed change to the PUD that would have some housing units located out by Daniels Road, would necessitate a change in the green space and so it seemed like a logical thing for the Planning Board to consider the proposed change in the green space for Country Squire Estates. The Planning Board's role in the requested change to the PUD is to provide input to the Town Board, who has the ultimate authority to decide whether to amend the existing PUD. M. Hill states that the chair adjourned the public hearing on this matter and the Planning Board at this point is not going to be taking any further action. The Board has received a great deal of information and many comments tonight. The Board will consider those and table the application to the next meeting. J. Bokus states that he has heard a lot of concern about Daniels Road and he understands as he lives there and has walked on it. His thoughts are that it is a dangerous road – dangerous for an adult to walk on, kids on bikes do not belong on it at all and that is the way it exists right now. There are no shoulders, there is no protection. He does not know how much traffic is going to increase from this project but he does not think it is going to have a huge impact. He states that the fact that when the green space for Country Squire was set up, there was no HOA, the land did not go to that and there was not access to the land, all you can do is look at it and it provides a buffer, that should have been addressed then, but it is what it is now. The acreage belongs to McNeary and J. Bokus does not see

April 8, 2014

anything detrimental about swapping a chunk of it from one end to the other. He states that it provides some good buffering and he is ok with it. J. Streit states that he thinks that we have received so much information that it is going to take the Board awhile to digest it and incorporate it in our planning. We will table this project and take it up at the next meeting. L. Palleschi asks whether the Board needs to go thru the completeness of application at this time or is the Board saying that everything that he has submitted is not complete yet. M. Hill states that he believes that L. Palleschi is asking if there is any additional information that any of the Board members believe is necessary, either because of questions raised by the public tonight or for any other reason, any additional information that the Board needs to receive from the applicant with regard to the proposed reconfiguration of the green space. Board agrees that they do not need anything at this time. M. Hill suggests that the Board not entertain any motions and leave it at that. The Board will take up the application at the next meeting. L. Palleschi states that he wanted to acknowledge that there are a couple of Board members who are not present tonight, so what if they ask for more information, and then we are into the same boat.

---

**WITT CONSTRUCTION – Major Subdivision Amendment**  
Old Stone Ridge

John Witt is present. He states that the Old Stone Ridge subdivision is 24 lots. He apologizes to the Board and the neighbors. When the project was approved, there was a no cut area on the map and he did not realize that that was on there. He went thru the meeting minutes and there is nothing in the notes that talks about having that strict clearing limit put on the map. He apologizes that he did not know it was there, they did clearing and the project got shut down. He would like to try to come up with a resolution to the situation. The ridge lots were very important to this project. He paid a premium for the land, it is very beautiful and they had to put a very expensive infrastructure system in to get up to the ridge. The only way they can recoup the money that they paid for the land and the road is to sell the ridge lots with the views. If they don't have the views, then they don't have the value. He states that he has reached out to the neighbors to see if they can come up with a compromise and see what can be done for replanting something. J. Witt explains on the map that this is a conservation subdivision where half the land is not buildable and where they put in a trail system that went around the property. He explains where the existing houses are built.

A public hearing is opened at 8:37 p.m. William Crowe, Old Stone Ridge Road, states that he has lived there approximately 5 years with his family. They are opposed to the amendment proposed to change the clearing limits. He states that he is also here because of the clear cutting that occurred. They had a meeting with J. Witt last fall when they were all concerned and disappointed with the clear cutting. He states that J. Witt stated to them that he could do whatever he wanted and if they did not want to look at it, they should have built on a lot up top. W. Crowe states that he does not remember when they sat down with J. Witt that he said that the most important lots were going to be the ones at the top. They are looking for some resolution. They want to know who is going to hold the applicant accountable. They found out after the meeting in the fall that J. Witt had hired an engineering firm, CT Male, paid them and submitted this site plan, it was a 17 page site plan that was submitted to the Town, the County, and the State. W. Crowe has the minutes from March 11 where J. Witt stated that it was a mistake and he was going to have to go back and look at the minutes to see what happened. W. Crowe states that it was a 17 page site plan that the applicant paid for and submitted to the Town, the County and the State, and now he is saying it was a mistake. If the hill is replanted tomorrow, it is never going to be what it was when they bought there and moved in. His question for the Town is what is the resolution here and who is going to address this and hold J. Witt accountable. Martin Shields, Lower Meadow Lane, states that he and his wife built their house and are new to the Town of Greenfield. They built with J. Witt because they like his building and the neighborhood, but they liked all the trees in it. The Town of Greenfield has a lot to offer, particularly the country element that you do not get in some suburban areas. As new residents of Old Stone Ridge and Greenfield, it is very important to them that that remains intact for the Town and the

April 8, 2014

development. He thinks that it is important that whatever was originally designed and agreed to put in place, remains in place. He states that old growth trees, don't grow overnight and even if there is going to be restoration of those trees it is going to be many years before they are what they were. Before there are any changes to allow additional cuts, M. Shields state that he thinks it is important to understand how that is going to impact the whole neighborhood and the presentation of that area. Joseph Carbonaro, Lower Meadow Lane, states that he has a couple of procedural questions. He understands that there were some letters or e-mails submitted and he wants to make sure that they were received and will find their way into the minutes. He asks if the Board anticipates that this would be the end of the public forum or, like last time, it would be adjourned and there would still be the possibility of commenting later on. J. Streit states that he thinks that there is enough unfinished business that the Board anticipates an adjournment as opposed to closing. J. Carbonaro states that he feels that we don't really know all that is going to transpire, what else J. Witt will have to propose. There is a temptation to try to look at 50 different scenarios and there are an infinite number of ways that you could look at, he thinks that the simplest way to do it is does the Board or does the Board not approve the amendment. He states that the Board knows how the neighbors feel, that they should not move one foot. He states that after that decision is made it might be a little clearer what additionally we can talk about by way of remediation for the considerable damage already done. J. Streit states that letters were received from Christopher Coccio, Lower Meadow Lane; Christine Fox; and Brian Green, Old Stone Ridge Road, each expressing their concerns and requesting remediation. There being no further public comments, this public hearing is adjourned at 8:46 p.m. J. Witt states that in September he had a meeting with all the neighbors because there were concerns about the clearing and he explained to them that he was allowed to clear for views for the view lots and that is what he intended to do. He states that his mistake was that he didn't realize the clearing limit was on the plans. He reiterates that he never would have gone thru the approval process, they needed the view to sell the lots, and some of the views would be selective and some would be a little clearer cutting, but that was always the intent. He would like to go forward with some kind of compromise. He also noted at that meeting that in the HOA documents that the residents received as part of their deeds, and filed with the AG's office, that clearing is allowed in HOA property for views. He explains what can and cannot be seen from different areas in the subdivision and that there is an area that he did not clear. He told B. Green that he would do his best to make sure to keep a buffer. The seven lots on the ridge were always intended to have views, you can see Vermont. That is why he put it in the HOA documents. He is working with the LA Group, what they have cleared is stabilized and there is no damage to be done further down the hill. Once the leaves are back on the trees and they clean up the mess that is there, because they got shut down in the middle of logging and it hasn't been cleaned up. He would like to be able to continue, clean it up and move forward. He states that M. Shields wanted to live in the woods, he lives in Lower Meadow Lane. The lot is in a meadow, not the woods. He states that the trees will grow up and there will be more trees there. If you want to be in the woods, build a house in the woods. Regarding the letter, the clients referred to moved to California. There were issues with water in the basement and it was resolved with sump pumps. Those have come back and J. Witt will be building for them on the ridge. J. Witt states that he spoke to K. Clifford today about maybe getting together before the meeting and coming up with something, but it didn't happen. He would love to get together with the neighbors, come up with a solution, walk the site, walk the trail, walk the ridge, etc. He asks how we can make it a win-win for both the Town and the neighbors. Can we make that ridge look pretty and plant, maybe, some apple trees along the ridge so the people who build at the top can have the views that were always intended and the people down below can look at nice apple trees. J. Streit states that he wasn't on the Board when this plan was approved, so he went to the Town and saw the original plans that were approved. They were signed by Gary Dake, the then chair of this Board; and two paid professionals by J. Witt, one of whom was the engineer. They signed off on this plan and it is exactly the plan shown here. It was clearly demarcated as a no cut zone, so to say that it was always the intent to cut that – the law is that there was a provision in the plan that that would be a no cut area. To say that it was not the intention that that would be a no cut area does not excuse the fact that it was, in J. Streit's mind, signed off by trained professionals. He states that intent maybe doesn't have the value of signatures on the site plan. B. Duffney states that no cut means no cut. He states that there is no old growth timber in Greenfield. This

April 8, 2014

was all farmland at one point. He is a NYS certified logger and has taken courses in Silva culture and they have specific rules that they have to follow on certain grades. He visited the site the other day and it is mowed. His question is that if this was the intention originally, to open up these lots on the top for the view, why wouldn't that be done first. J. Witt states because when they set the houses exactly where they set them on the ridge, they still don't want to totally clear cut. Until they set the house in the exact spot, they want to leave some trees. That is the reason why it was in the HOA documents that they could clear for the view. He does not like to clear cut just to clear cut. He likes to clear for the view once they set the house. B. Duffney states that you can clear out the bigger trees so you can see where the view is going to be ahead of time. At this point, the neighbors have already bought their homes at the bottom of the development and they have had the realtors say that certain areas were going to remain forested. He has been involved with forestry and excavating for the biggest part of his life, he does not want to say that it is a little deceivment, but he does want to say that the top should have been cut for the views first and that way when the neighbors bought on the lowest part of the property, they would already see what it was going to look like. J. Bokus states that he agrees that there is an agreed to plan and then trees were cut down. There is a violation issue and now a request from the applicant. We need the Town Attorney to tell us how to balance those two issues. M. Hill states that his basic understanding is that the applicant is back in front of this Board seeking an amendment of the original approval for purposes of resolving what would otherwise be a violation situation. That is why we are here, there has been a recognition that the original clearing limits have not been complied with and now there is an application to change those clearing limits. S. Weeks states that this plan was stamped by a registered landscape architect and a licensed professional engineer who were hired by the applicant and it is very clear that there was a limit of clearing and grading. He thinks that limit needs to be stayed to. That is what everyone expected – the Planning Board, the Town – and so some way to rectify what has already been done. Whether you do that with a licensed forester who can help suggest what should be replanted there, something along that line has got to be the resolution. T. Siragusa states that he agrees with everything that S. Weeks just said. He does not see any other way around that. We have an agreed to plan, it's the law, and it's what the neighbors built their houses around that particular expectation. In his view, there needs to be a remediation to put it back the way that it was in some complete and detailed plan on how that is going to happen. A. McKnight states that he also agrees with what S. Weeks stated. There is a plan, it has been agreed to and the plan should stand. The plan is in force, we have all agreed to it, licensed professionals, etc. He can understand a need to amend a plan or approach the Board to amend a plan, that is reasonable as well. The Board may choose to deny that request. We are in a situation where the plan has been violated, the neighbors' rights have been upset and he does not know if we are the one to negotiate and try to figure this out. M. Hill states that this Board is not an enforcement board. His understanding is that the applicant is before the Planning Board with a proposed amendment to the plan. He believes that the applicant's goal here is to try to come up with a plan, a proposal to address what would otherwise be a violation that would be dealt with through an enforcement process and deal with it here as opposed to thru an enforcement process. This Board gave the original approval to the subdivision plan and this Board has the authority to grant a modification to that plan if it is deemed appropriate to do so. The whole question becomes, what is the applicant proposing and does this Board find that to be an acceptable alternative to the original plan. A. McKnight states that his question is that the applicant is saying this is the way it is now, accept it or not. To him, he does not have a detailed plan from the applicant as to what are we going to accept. It is not the Board's place to come up with an idea. M. Hill states that we have an application with a proposed change in the limits of clearing. The question before the Board is, is this plan acceptable to this Board for this proposed change in the limits of clearing. J. Witt states he is open to coming up with a resolution with the neighbors and coming up with a reclaiming scheme, buffer scheme, making it better than it is now, because it looks terrible. They cleared and then they got shut down. He would like to clean it up; he would like to continue to market the houses; they would like to submit for a permit this week to the Town for another home, which is not on the ridge lot so it is not affected by this; they would like to keep constructing homes there and sell the rest of it. A. McKnight states that he understands but what he does not have, and may be missing it in the paperwork, is a request from J. Witt as to what the new plan is. J. Witt explains on the map. He states that he is very sensitive to trees, very sensitive to

April 8, 2014

views and privacy. He is willing to replant the buffers, meet with them, come up with a win-win, but we have to get to that point. He is hoping to modify what they proposed, but he would like to meet with the neighbors first and maybe they can all agree to something that makes them all happier. M. Hill states that as the Board members have expressed their views and concerns with the plan as it is being proposed and at the same time J. Witt has indicated that he would like to have an opportunity to talk with the neighbors and he may have some ideas for perhaps modifying this proposal to include some replanting or something, subject to his discussion with the neighbors. M. Hill states that it seems that based on the comments tonight that the Board is very reluctant to the plan that it has in front of them at the present time. He suggests that the Board might want to table this matter and allowing J. Witt the opportunity to perhaps further develop his ideas for some type of a different plan that would involve some replanting, etc., and have an opportunity to talk with the neighbors about that. It doesn't appear that this plan before the Board would be something that the Board would be comfortable in approving. A. McKnight states that he would like to know that the neighbors are comfortable with the applicant's plan before he would approve it. J. Streit states that he shares the feeling that the Board is not prepared to retroactively approve of something that they didn't approve in the first place, but that we might be open to letting the applicant approach us with a plan of mitigation. T. Siragusa states to A. McKnight's point, he would be comfortable in hearing that proposal if it had been proposed prior to a public hearing. The applicant seems willing to open new discussions with the public; the neighbors certainly have an opinion of what they want to hear. He would like to know that those discussions have happened before our next meeting, not during our next meeting. Board agrees. J. Streit states that then the Board remains open to being re-approached by the applicant once he has had discussions. He states that what the HOA states is a moot point as it has not yet kicked in. M. Hill asks if then the Board is going to table this application. J. Streit states that is correct and the applicant can re-submit a plan. M. Hill states that then the applicant has an opportunity to consider the matter further, consider possible alternatives and discuss those alternatives with the neighbors. J. Szpak states that the public hearing was on the application that is before the Board right now, not anything different. J. Streit states that the public hearing was adjourned so that it may be reopened so that people will have the opportunity to comment further. B. Duffney states that the side of the hill is pretty barren and he believes that it should be stabilized a little bit. C. Baker states that he has been by the site, but hasn't looked at it in detail. J. Streit states that that would be part of the mitigation. B. Duffney states that something should be done sooner. C. Baker states that the applicant is still under obligation under the SW General Permit to make sure that the site remains stable. There is an existing permit which requires the applicant to have an inspector look at the job weekly and file reports and if there are any areas that are unstable and need to be stabilized, then they have to be addressed. This is ongoing until the subdivision is completed. C. Baker explains the SW general permit. G. McKenna should be getting those reports and if there are any problems that G. McKenna is uncomfortable with he usually calls EDP to take a look. J. Szpak states that he would also like to work thru G. McKenna because there is an area that is a safety concern because there are trees that are leaning on top of other trees and J. Witt has agreed to remediate those. G. McKenna has stated that he is very open to having those safety conditions taken care of that were outlined by Cornell Cooperative Extension and the trees have all been marked. J. Streit states that anything that can be resolved before it comes here would be appreciated. M. Hill states that the concern about the leaning trees should be brought to G. McKenna's attention. C. Baker agrees, because if G. McKenna issued the stop work order, he is the only one who can lift that. J. Streit states that stop work does not mean stop stabilizing.

---

**ROBERT BACIGALUPO – Special Use Permit/Site Plan Review**

NYS Route 9N

R. Bacigalupo is present. B. Duffney states that he is the president of the Greenfield Community and Business Association of which R. Bacigalupo is a member and he is friends with some of the neighbors, but he will not recuse himself because he believes that he can look this right down the middle as it is presented. R. Bacigalupo states that he has submitted an application for his business and will

April 8, 2014

answer any questions the Board may have. He has a trucking company with 4 trucks right now, 2 tractors and 2 tri-axle dump trucks. He states that he thought that when the meetings were held in 2007 that he was grandfathered in. He now has a fourth truck so he wants to make sure everything is ok. J. Streit reads from G. McKenna's notes that the applicant is applying for an extension from a pre-existing, non-conforming use to a conforming use as a large contractor's storage yard. Definition is attached and J. Streit reads it. A. McKnight asks about the slope of the land. R. Bacigalupo states that it is sloped up from Rt. 9N to the house and then it levels off, and there are no wetlands on the site. T. Siragusa asks what changes have taken place to the property since 2007. R. Bacigalupo states that he took some trees down, added a fourth truck, and added the mulch bins with concrete blocks to keep it nice and neat. He does maintenance in the red garage and he has a storage building in the back. T. Siragusa asks what is driving the need for the 4<sup>th</sup> truck, more business, etc. R. Bacigalupo states that he has been moving some logs, equipment, he has subcontracted to DA Collins and he moves some bigger equipment so he got a bigger truck. T. Siragusa asks if it is an expansion of the business or a change in the business. R. Bacigalupo states a change in the business and expansion. S. Weeks asks if there are storage bunks with concrete block walls. R. Bacigalupo states that they are. B. Duffney asks where the applicant parks his trucks. R. Bacigalupo states that in the winter he puts them all inside the garages. In the summer he washes next to the red garage and then leaves them parked near there. He has 6 trailers and parks 2 behind the red garage, 1 is currently parked in the first bin of the mulch bin and 1 next to the bin. Public hearing is discussed and set for April 29, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. R. Bacigalupo submits a letter from some of the neighbors.

---

**CASEY CORNELL – Major Subdivision**

Humes Road

Casey Cornell and Jim Vianna, Surveyor, are present. B. Duffney recuses himself. C. Cornell states that they are working on getting the letter from the DEC regarding the pond. J. Vianna states that there were some questions from the Board at the last meeting regarding the ROW from the cul-de-sac to the lands of Peter Nichols. He states that they have a signed notarized affidavit from the previous owners who C. Cornell bought the land from stating that they have given no one access thru their property to any other property. He states that there was some use there, but it was some form of verbal license. Based on what he read in the minutes, there was some concern about not giving a right-of-way or land locking this parcel, and that is not true. This parcel has over 1000' of frontage on Ridge Road, which runs down past the parcel in question to Coy Road. He states that Ridge Road has been officially abandoned by the Town of Greenfield, but that does not extinguish the right-of-way. He originally proposed the 40' ROW, labeled it as 'proposed', and he believes that they are in agreement that they would like to keep it as a proposed ROW. He states that he thinks it is in the best interest to show it as a proposed ROW and when this finally gets recorded, maybe 10 years down the road it might happen, but at least they can define where it would be. He states that he thinks it has been removed from the engineer's plans. J. Streit reiterates that there apparently was a verbal agreement, but no written, standing agreement. The applicant is apparently willing to grant an easement, but has not been approached by the property owner. J. Vianna states that there have been discussions but no conclusion and it is obviously not going to happen for nothing. J. Streit states that there is nothing that has been concluded and he believes that is out of the purview of the Board, what does or does not happen with P. Nichols property. M. Hill states that essentially that is correct. Whatever access that P. Nichols had in the past, according to the information that has been submitted by the applicant, there is no easement of record for access from Humes Road thru lands of C. Cornell. J. Vianna states that the affidavit was performed prior to the closing with C. Cornell, he reads from the statement that "I/we have allowed no easements, rights-of-way, continuous driveway usage.....or other rights of passage to others over the premises and have no knowledge of such...." M. Hill states that he thinks that takes this out of the authority of the Planning Board. Whatever rights P. Nichols has he has and the Planning Board, if it moves forward with an approval of this subdivision, regardless of whether the possible easement is depicted on the plans or not, the Planning Board's action is

April 8, 2014

not going to have any effect on his rights of access that the owners of this property couldn't extinguish themselves by simply canceling whatever prior verbal arrangements there might have been. He does not see that the Planning Board has any authority here with regard to the question of an easement or non-easement. C. Cornell states that G. Robinson has to submit responses and changes per C. Baker's letter and hopefully by the next meeting they should have the pond issue and responses. M. Hill states that with regard to the possible easement in the future and the way it is depicted on the survey, he suggests that rather than calling it a 'proposed easement', because that almost has the connotation that it is being proposed as part of the application and then once the Board signs off on it, it then comes into existence, his suggestions would be to label that 'possible future easement'. He thinks that will connote that it is not something that is coming into existence with the filing of the map. C. Baker states that he would agree with that. J. Vianna will take care of that. M. Hill states that the Board will meet next on April 29<sup>th</sup>. C. Baker states that he will be away for 10 days during this period so chances are he will not have a chance to respond to anything that is submitted. This application will be on the May 13, 2014 agenda.

---

**VERIZON WIRELESS – Site Plan Review**

South Greenfield Road

Robert McCabe is present for the application and explains that they are looking to collocate on the existing cell tower at 62 South Greenfield Road. There will be 12 antennas at the 152' height, 6 will be 96" tall and 6 will be 69" tall. On the ground they will have a 12' x 30' equipment shelter and a 4' x 14' space for a propane tank, all within the existing compound. There will be no structural alterations made to the tower and a structural analysis has been submitted and after this installation, the tower is still at a 72% sufficient capacity. He states that Sprint is at 162' and AT & T is at 182'. All cables will be inside the monopole. S. Weeks asks the height of the shelter. R. McCabe states that it is 10'. S. Weeks states that it would be nice to see that on the plans. T. Siragusa questions that this will be the third shelter on the property and if there are other generators on the site. R. McCabe confirms what is there. C. Baker states that this is pretty straightforward and that the Planning Board has done a number of these applications.

**RESOLUTION – VERIZON WIRELESS, Site Plan Review**

MOTION: A. McKnight

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board approves the application of Verizon Wireless for a Site Plan review for property located at 62 South Greenfield Road, TM#138.-1-92.12, per the application submitted.

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

Noes: None

Absent: Gyarmathy, Yasenchak

---

**SKIDMORE COLLEGE – Site Plan Review**

Denton Road

Dave Carr, LA Group, and Dan Rodecker, Skidmore College, are present. D. Carr states that this is a site plan application for the expansion of the existing parking area for the baseball field and this is a requirement of the approved PUD for the Skidmore solar installation. He explains on the plans the existing area vs. the new area to be installed. They will go from 35 spaces to 66 spaces. The plan also includes the port-a-john enclosure which was included in the PUD application. It will be Skidmore green with yellow trim. There will be one small area of pavement for the two handicap spaces and they will have signage. The increase in impervious area is about .3 acres and the drainage concept matches what

April 8, 2014

was proposed and already constructed at the solar array. They are not adding any additional lighting, there are a few trees that need to be cut down to put the loop in, which is designed to be able to handle a large bus turning around. The bus would be dropping the teams off and then either staying in the lot or returning to campus until the game is over. The thin shaded areas on the plan are because the existing parking area did not meet code, exactly, so the thin areas are increased areas of gravel to bring it up to the 24' wide travel lane and two 18' parking aisles. S. Weeks questions the area with the number 3 in it. D. Carr states that is for 3 additional parking spaces. It was a dead area and they figured they might need the 3 additional spaces at some time. It made sense to put in parking where it could be comfortably located. D. Carr states that in 2013 there were 8 game days, 5 were double-headers. He is not sure what the schedule is this year, but probably similar. The port-a-johns are out there only a couple of months in the fall and then a couple months in the spring. C. Baker states that he has reviewed this. In the SW management report they have identified riparian buffers and those should be shown on the plan and should be marked as permanent, with signs. He didn't see any kind of pretreatment before going into the storm water basin. D. Carr states that it is the grass filter strip which is the same as was used on the solar. C. Baker states that is ok. D. Carr states that they are putting in the kind of French drain pit and it is working great at the other side. C. Baker states he noticed that. B. Duffney asks about lighting. D. Carr states that there is existing lighting. There are about 6, they are about 10' and they are security lights, they are very low level and it has nothing to do with the baseball activity. They basically light the lot for security reasons. They do not play at night so there is no reason for anyone to be there at night. D. Rodecker confirms that there is no intention to use the site at night. C. Baker states that he is confident that the applicant will take care of his comments when they bring in the plans for signature. M. Hill states that the Board should consider whether anything being proposed would constitute any change to or be materially different from what the Planning Board previously reviewed and approved for SEQRA and whether or not anything being proposed would have any kind of significant adverse environmental impact. D. Carr explains that this is exactly the plan except for those few parking spaces that were added, however, it did not impact the storm water management. They took the opportunity to add these parking spaces because what they heard in the PUD process was that the Town and a lot of neighbors had issues with people parking on the road during events.

**RESOLUTION – Skidmore College, Site Plan Review**

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: J. Bokus

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board reaffirms its prior SEQRA Negative Declaration of the Skidmore College PUD, including the required Site Plan Review for the expansion of the parking area, for property located at Denton Road, TM#152.-1-75.

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

Noes: None

Absent: Gyarmathy, Yasenchak

**RESOLUTION – Skidmore College**

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: A. McKnight

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board approves the application of Skidmore College for a site plan review for the baseball field parking expansion as required by the Skidmore PUD and waives a public hearing for property located at Denton Road, TM#152.-1-75, per the plan submitted.

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

Noes: None

Absent: Gyarmathy, Yasenchak

---

April 8, 2014

**ZBA REFERRAL**

**Dave Evans** – Area variance request for frontage on a lot previously approved in the 1980's. This is also before the Town Board for an open development permit. No Planning Board issues.

**Greenfield Community & Business Association** – B. Duffney explains the request for an area variance for a sign. No Planning Board issues.

---

Meeting adjourned 10:08 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland  
Secretary