

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD**

March 29, 2016

REGULAR MEETING

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

MINUTES – March 8, 2016

MOTION: S. Weeks

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of March 8, 2016, as submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Gyarmathy, Roeckle, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Bokus, Siragusa, Streit

PLANNING BOARD CASE

JOHN JORDAN – Minor Subdivision

Middle Grove Road

Laura Wilday, J. Jordan's daughter, and Richard Kline are present for the application. R. Kline explains that this is an 8.32 acre lot and they wish to subdivide it into 3 lots. L. Wilday and R. Kline will be building on the center lot and the third lot will be up to J. Jordan to build on eventually. The house on the middle lot will be set back 250 – 300 feet; colonial, timber frame. B. Duffney states that we received the information from the County on the driveways. L. Wilday states that the driveways are now marked on the survey along with the sight distance. The County representative did have a specific location for the third lot and it has been marked accordingly. B. Duffney questions that the driveway for the first parcel comes out on Hyspot Road. L. Wilday states that is correct, that is where the existing house is located. B. Duffney states that this fits zoning. S. Weeks states that he is familiar with the neighborhood as he lives close by and sight distance would have been his only concern. It looks fine to him. R. Roeckle questions if the cottage is actually a separate residence on lot 1. L. Wilday states that it is a separate structure; it is not a separate residence. M. Gyarmathy states that the only question he had was the sight distance and everything else looks good. T. Yasenchak states that she had a question about the note that the surveyor put on the plans that the 60' right-of-way is assumed.

(T. Siragusa arrives at 7:05 p.m.)

R. Kline states that he believes that is because the lot extends through the road, so the main highway goes right through their property. T. Yasenchak asks C. Baker about the 100' vs 150' setback for the well. C. Baker provides the applicant with the typical notes. He states that the sizes of the septic should be removed so as not to cause confusion as an engineer will be designing a site-specific septic. That would cover the concern with the wells because it will have to be documented. B. Duffney asks how far back the house is going to go on lot 2. R. Kline states 250 to 300'. B. Duffney questions that this would require the turnaround for a firetruck. C. Baker states that is for a 500' driveway. T. Siragusa asks why they are building so far back. R. Kline states just so that they are off of the main road and to provide a buffer. L.

March 29, 2016

Wilday states that it will be a deep lot. She questions that they are to remove the septic sizes from the survey. C. Baker concurs and states that they need to add the notes. A public hearing is discussed and set for April 12th at 7:00 p.m.

SKIDMORE COLLEGE – Site Plan Review

Van Patten House Cottage and Van Patten Carriage House

Dave Carr, the LA Group and Dan Rodecker, Skidmore College, are present. D. Carr states that they were before the Planning Board about a year ago for a site plan review for the Waring House. He states that the Van Patten property was a substandard lot and they have done a lot line adjustment to meet current zoning with each structure on its own lot. Also, since they are requesting to repurpose the structures into office space they cannot be on one lot. They met with G. McKenna about all of this and that is why they have 2 separate applications. The Cottage sits on a lot that is just under 1.2 acres; it is the vacant house which has been vacant for a few years since Skidmore purchased it. It is 3 stories, 5500 square feet and will be converted into offices, moving more administrative personnel from the campus off-site to the cottage. The carriage house is just under 2000 square feet and is an existing garage which will be converted into offices. In looking at the site now, there is an existing patio in the back, existing circular driveway in front of the house, quite a bit of gravel in another area and a gravel driveway off the dirt road. He explains where North Broadway pretty much ends at the cottage. He states that what Skidmore would like to do and what they are proposing is that the Surrey, the Admissions office south of the Waring House, includes a 44 car parking lot, which is underutilized. There is a provision in the Town's regulations for shared parking, so what Skidmore would like to do is to utilize the existing parking in this location. The distance is about 350' so it is not very far. There is an existing sidewalk which runs to the end of the Waring House parcel and they would be picking that up. D. Carr states that it is very similar to the way parking works on campus where parking lots are rarely right in front of the building. There are actually larger parking areas where employees regularly have to walk a distance, probably much farther than this. The idea was to remove all of the gravel and reseed it because they like the existing character of the area. They would be reducing the impervious area by a little under 2/10ths of an acre between removing the gravel and adding the sidewalk. By utilizing the existing parking, they would be doing less disturbance. T. Yasenchak states that our code does allow for joint parking and she reads from the code, S. 105-121. She states that we would have to check with our attorney, even though these are all owned by Skidmore, because they are separate parcels we will need to have some type of covenant in there. D. Carr states that they also feel that is necessary, but wanted to make sure before they take that step. T. Yasenchak states that she likes seeing the parking lot condensed and people walking. It allows for more greenspace, it allows it to look like one big facility or larger house with a carriage house. D. Carr states that is the idea. Skidmore really wants to keep the character. They know they need to add the walks, but it will be a little nicer in removing some gravel. D. Rodecker states that they originally looked at putting in parking, it created a lot of pavement and then they would have storm water concerns. T. Yasenchak states that she likes what Skidmore has done in that area because you really don't know that they are offices. They have continued to have that look of North Broadway from Saratoga. D. Carr states that there is no signage associated with it, etc. S. Weeks questions that since there won't be any parking at all at the carriage house, what is the handicap parking situation. D. Carr states that there is handicap parking at the Surrey lot. They kind of struggled with that. They are not proposing any parking and there is existing handicap parking. The thought would be that they do have this existing circle and his idea was to designate some parking here for handicap because they do have a couple of ramps there. The College's feeling was that if there was a handicapped person visiting, they could pull up on the existing driveway, leave the person off and leave their car there. He states that they could put a sign there designating that. The thought was that they really don't want to create any new pavement. It is large enough so if they want to stripe some handicap spots close to the ramp, they can and it could actually serve both buildings because all the walks by grade and width are handicapped. T. Yasenchak reads from the regulations regarding the handicap parking spaces. D. Carr states that he will check into this further. B. Duffney asks the number of employees. D. Carr states that the carriage house will be 5 employees with one summer intern and the cottage will be 11 employees with 2 summer interns. B. Duffney questions the number of parking

March 29, 2016

spaces at the Waring House. D. Rodecker states that there are between 18 and 20. D. Carr states that there is parking for that building. B. Duffney states that he does not know how many handicap spaces you need for "x" amount of employees. D. Carr states that generally you need roughly 5% of the parking, but it really is based on the amount of parking you offer, not necessarily the employees. He believes that the Waring house has 2 and at the Surrey there are at least 4, but they will check that. D. Carr states that they can create the spaces without creating any new impervious area. B. Duffney questions that this is city sewer and water, and they have landscaping included in the plans. D. Carr concurs that they have city sewer and water, and that they are not really doing any new landscaping. It is already landscaped very nicely. They are removing gravel and seeding it. He states that it is currently very wooded and that is the character they want to keep. It is kind of like a garage in the woods. B. Duffney questions what they will have for lighting. D. Carr states that there is existing street lighting and there will only be lighting on the buildings. These offices will not be utilized at night. He explains that the lower parking is lit. D. Rodecker states that the one building will house the Special Programs Office and the majority of their work is in the summer. During the winter months they will be out around 4:00. T. Siragusa questions that for the circular driveway, is there any parking there now. D. Rodecker states that it is currently vacant. D. Carr states that he would assume that people parked there when it was a home and you could park there now, but he doesn't think it meets any standard for width. You could definitely park there. T. Siragusa questions if there would be visitors. D. Rodecker states that they would have a few, but most of the visitors would be on campus because they bring in the groups for the summer in classrooms. T. Siragusa questions that they think that based on requirements there is enough parking for all the employees. D. Carr and D. Rodecker concur. D. Carr states that they are asking for a 10% reduction. The square footage requirement is for 48 and there are 44, they are asking to waive 4. D. Carr states that even though they may need more during construction, there is parking on North Broadway, which is pretty wide in that location, it is a dead-end road, and the only property owner in this area is the college. There are no private residences anymore. T. Yasenchak questions the reason for no sidewalk from the parking lot to the building. There is the circular drive, the parking area, then the parking in the back. D. Carr states that there is a walk from the parking lot into the Waring House. T. Yasenchak states that for the cottage and the carriage house, there is no sidewalk from the parking lot to the cottage. D. Carr states that they could put a walk across. He explains that there is a 2 to 3' grade difference with a small wall in the front. Further discussion takes place about a location for a walk. B. Duffney asks where the current handicapped spots are located. They are pointed out. M. Gyarmathy questions that when they did their parking calculations they went from the Surrey and used the Admissions parking and Waring House parking. He questions that they cannot pick up 4 spaces in front of the cottage. D. Carr states that they might be able to pick up 2 handicap spaces. The problem is that there are specific dimensional requirements and he thinks that a car can easily park there with another car getting around it, but he does not believe that it meets the dimensional requirements. Philosophically, he thinks that people can park there and maybe will park there, short term, if someone has to deliver something, etc. They do not want to create any more impervious area if they don't have to. M. Gyarmathy asks what is going to happen with the Admissions building. D. Rodecker states that no one is in there right now. They moved Admissions into the Waring house, which was a temporary initial plan but they like it there very much. They will most likely stay there and they will probably move their marketing group to the old Admissions Office. He states that they are attempting to get the offices off campus, which are not day-to-day with the students. It would be the same number of people in the Admissions building. M. Gyarmathy states that he likes the idea of the walkways in the back and maybe they can pick up a handicap spot in front of the cottage. C. Baker questions what the surface of the hardscape area behind the Cottage is. D. Carr states that it is like flagstone and is existing. He states that he has the feeling that eventually the College will remove it and create a landscaped area. There is an existing barbecue there and a pool that was already filled in. D. Rodecker states that they are planning to just clean it up for now. D. Carr states that in the future it will probably get smaller. C. Baker questions that we should be doing a referral to the City of Saratoga Springs. A public hearing is discussed and set for April 12th at 7:00 p.m. T. Yasenchak reiterates that the concerns were for the handicap parking, walkways and the covenants.

March 29, 2016

JOHN KEYZER – Minor Subdivision

North Creek Road

John Keyzer is present and reviews that he has submitted a revised plan. Due to sight distance issues site work would have been required and they decided to revise the plan instead. He states that Ernest Gailor has done the sight distance work in accordance with AASHTO. T. Yasenchak states that G. McKenna indicates that this meets the regulations for keyhole lots. She asks about the remaining lot as it is not shown on this plan. The Board needs to see that remaining parcel. C. Baker agrees. S. Weeks states that he likes the way it has been changed. T. Yasenchak questions that there is a stream shown on lot 3. J. Keyzer states that it is not a stream, it is drainage. There is no running water on the site. T. Yasenchak states that the surveyor should address that. C. Baker states that since it is shown on the map as what would be a stream, it would need to be clarified. M. Gyarmathy states that this is a smart way to solve the sight distance issues. C. Baker states that he needs time to review the sight distance information as it is kind of unconventional the way that it is documented, so he may have some questions. A public hearing is discussed and set for April 12th at 7:00 p.m.

ZBA REFERRALS

G. David Evans – T. Yasenchak states that we did receive a memo from the Town Attorney and per that memo the applicant will be need to come back before the Planning Board.

DISCUSSION

A letter was received from the Environmental Commission commending the Planning Board on their reviews of two recent applications.

Meeting adjourned 7:57 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary