

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD**

February 14, 2017

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, John Bokus Nathan Duffney, Michael Gyarmathy, Stan Weeks, John Streit and Robert Roeckle, Alternate. Thomas Siragusa is absent. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer is present.

MINUTES – December 29, 2015

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: M. Gyarmathy

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board states that there is a page missing from January 10, 2017 minutes. No Merrills and Saratoga Polo the last page not on current minutes. Review the January 31, 2017 minutes and we will go over them at our next meeting.

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Roeckle, Streit, Weeks, And Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Siragusa,

PLANNING BOARD CASES

**MERCHANT – Special Use Permit
South Greenfield Rd.**

Ken Merchant is present for the applicant. T. Yasenchak asks are looking to do a storage yard? T. Yasenchak states that the purposed structures are 30’x40’ and you are looking for a garage for storage for your masonry equipment and possible construction of a 40’x100’ building. T. Yasenchak asks if there is a site plan. K. Merchant states that he submitted it to G. Mc Kenna. T. Yasenchak states that while the secretary is looking for your site plan we can ask you some questions. T. Yasenchak states that the applicant has pretty thorough requirements. T. Yasenchak states that a special use permit for a small contractor storage yard does have a limitation. The number and size of the trucks that are coming and going could you let us know what kind of trucks and how many will you have coming and going? K. Merchant states he has one. T. Yasenchak states ok you just have one, and asks if that is the only truck that will be coming and going? K. Merchant states that is the only large truck. T. Yasenchak asks if the large truck will be bringing your mason supplies or do you have other trucks that will be bringing that equipment in and out as well? K. Merchant states that there will be other trucks coming and going as well. B. Duffney states that it is a form truck. K. Merchant agrees. T. Yasenchak asks if you have any other trucks that will be bringing supplies and materials or all the materials or are the supplies being delivered to the site? K. Merchant states depend on the project. T. Yasenchak asks if there was a recent survey done that shows the existing buildings, and does it show that garage arm? K. Merchant states that he drew it on there. T. Yasenchak states that we have a couple of items we are going to run through. T. Yasenchak asks if applicant has employees that come his site or the work site. K. Merchant states that they don’t always go to his site before the work site. T. Yasenchak states that the Board would like a narrative that addresses our items in the code A-N that’s lists out what we need to make a decision for a Special Use Permit. T. Yasenchak states that she is going to go

over them really quick but, then we will need that in writing for our files so we can make a determination. T. Yasenchak states that we also will need it for public hearing, which is required for a Special Use Permit neighbors can come and look at the information and understand what is happening. T. Yasenchak states that that they will not be more objectionable to nearby property vibration, lamination, fumes and noise things of that nature. T. Yasenchak states that on the site plan we ask for any lighting on the garage or anywhere on your property and if you want a new garage put that on your site plan. T. Yasenchak asks if K. Merchant has that on his site plan any kind of lighting. K. Merchant states that he does not have it on the plan but, he does have a pole with a light on it and on his garage he does have a light on his garage. T. Yasenchak starts that will need to be shown on the plan too, and that helps so we know that it isn't pointing toward any neighbors. T. Yasenchak states that we ask especially if you are doing this 30'x100' what that building will be used for and where any kind of drainage will go, if you are changing the topography or any kind of grading. T. Yasenchak asks if there will be any kind of signs. T. Yasenchak asks if the new building going to have a septic system? K. Merchant states that it's strictly storage. T. Yasenchak states that there is a whole list of things to go over. T. Yasenchak asks how many employees on an average will come to your site and then leaves and what time will leave and what time of day will that be. T. Yasenchak states that they will need the proposed location and height of building and structures and parking. T. Yasenchak states that when it comes to trucks and small contractor storage yards we are aware of trying to have a buffer between the neighbors because of the backup beeping. T. Yasenchak states that we require adequate screening or landscaping for exterior lights. T. Yasenchak states that if there is anything that could be shown on a site plan than it should be shown the site plan. T. Yasenchak asks the Board if they have any questions. B. Duffney asks it is basically going to be used for spare cement block and stuff to go with the business and some equipment? K. Merchant states yes. B. Duffney states that another thing we have had with neighbors sometimes there is an issue with head lights shining in the neighbors windows or whatever the case maybe we have asked the applicant to go a different direction with their trucks, the way they pull in, or back around whatever the case may be. B. Duffney states that he is not sure if that's the case. K. Merchant states that it is pretty deep in the woods, it's at least 400'-500' off the road. S. Weeks states that there are a lot of questions that need to be answered for a Special Use Permit and the other thing is the small contractor's yard and as T. Yasenchak stated that is specific things, and once you respond to all those things you should be in good shape. M. Gyarmathy and J. Bokus do not have anything to add at this time. C. Baker asks that the Zoning enforcement officer mentioned there was a notice violation and I am curious what that was and what the complaint was? T. Yasenchak states that the Zoning enforcement Officer noted that K. Merchant is here because there was a violation and you have been operating this for a while and there is not a Special Use Permit in place for the operation of small contractor yard on the lot. T. Yasenchak states that it was brought to the Zoning Enforcement Officers attention by a neighbor and asks if K. Merchant knows anything regarding that? K. Merchant states that no one has come out and told him but, everyone knows. T. Yasenchak states that right now the applicant is here now to amend that. M. Gyarmathy asks if it is a noise complaint or lighting complaint. T. Yasenchak states that the Zoning Enforcement Officer did not say. B. Duffney asks C. Baker would the size of that purpose building 40'x100' is there anything that he has to do with run off from that side. C. Baker states no it's way less than an acre. T. Yasenchak states that if you can get us that information to us. K. Merchant asks if the next meeting is 2/28/2017. T. Yasenchak states that the first meeting of the month is a workshop meeting and that's when we will look at an application and deem it complete and if at that meeting we deem it complete then we will put you on our next meeting and since we don't have all the information that is required for a Special Use Permit then you will be on our next workshop meeting, which is the second Tuesday of March. T. Yasenchak states that we do need all the information no later than a week before hand. T. Yasenchak states that she knows that it sounds like a long time but, it's really only two weeks. T. Yasenchak explains why we need that information ahead of time. J. Streit states to back up S. Weeks comment it might be a good idea to find out the nature of the complaint not necessarily who made the complaint, so you make sure you address those issues particularly when you respond to the questions that you are required to answer. T. Yasenchak states that at the next meeting if we find your application deemed complete we will put you on the next meeting and we actually then schedule a public hearing and that's when your neighbors will be noticed and they will be able to come in and see the application at the Town Hall and then they will be able to come and speak.

377 MIDDLE GROVE ROAD – Special Use Permit/Site Plan Review

Middle Grove Road

Lindsey Halse from Kasselmann Solar present for the applicant. T. Yasenchak states that because this applicant has been in front of the Board before and the applicant has been in front of the Zoning Board and received an Area Variance to allow for the development for ground mount solar we have placed this case not as a workshop project but, as a regular review, a determination meeting. T. Yasenchak states we have scheduled and noticed a public hearing on this project, and explains the process. L. Halse states that she is here because they are purposing 20 Solar panels on 377 Lake Desolation Rd. L. Halse states that the solar panels are 5.8kw and the highest point is 30 degrees tilt. T. Yasenchak asks if they are planning on clearing any land. L. Halse states no and the land was already cleared. T. Yasenchak states that they are opening the public hearing at 7:21 and asks if there is anyone here that would like to speak regarding this project? T. Yasenchak states that there is no one here from the public that would like to speak regarding this project and there was a public hearing regarding this project with the Zoning Board, how does the Board feel about closing the public hearing? All in favor of closing the public hearing at 7:22. T. Yasenchak states that they did just pass a law in the town for Solar. T. Yasenchak asks L. Halse to give the Board a bit of an over view of the new material that was presented the Board. L. Halse explains that there company software went through a bit of an update (the design software that they use) and supplied more detailed setbacks maps and included a mock ground mount solar 350' of the set back. L. Halse states that she sent letters to the 3 neighbors that are in view of the ground mount solar panels and she has received both back from them in support of the panels. L. Halse got the elevation from the perspective owners and next door neighbors for visibility, she also provided a larger site plan to give a better idea where the panels will be in relation to the home and photos of other ground mounts that we have installed in the nearby area to give a visual of what they look like. T. Yasenchak asks what the color is the actual structure? L. Halse states that the structure will be dark silver with the model black panels. T. Yasenchak asks if it can be a darker color. It is in our code. L. Halse states that if it is required we could most likely paint them they pretty dark and from the front you would barely see them and from the back it probably would be distracting to have it darker because of the back of the panels are white so having a darker background would be more distracting but, we could if that was required. T. Yasenchak asks if there is any way the back of the panels could be any other color. L. Halse states that she does not believe they are produced any other color. T. Yasenchak states that the thought behind that with the solar with the law was that with the darker color it blends more into the background into the trees and it doesn't actually look like a structure. M. Gyarmathy states that he doesn't have any questions and has spent a lot of time reviewing all the information L. Halse has given us. S. Weeks states that the code does call for black, brown, or dark gray and it does say exception may be made during special use permit by the Planning Board I don't see it as an issue. S. Weeks asks why are the panels being made flat? L. Halse states that 30 degrees is the optimum. L. Halse states that the AZ myth is optimum at 180 degrees tilt and 30 degrees, the structure being angled at 180 degrees and the panels being tilted at 30 degrees that is the optimum production for our area. B. Duffney states that being in the area we have that ability to change the color of the panels would be happy with leaving the colors the way they are. J. Streit states to see the back of the panels you would have to be a trespasser. J. Bokus states that he does not have any questions. C. Baker states he does not any questions. T. Yasenchak asks if we have to do SEQRA. C. Baker asks if it is in the new code. T. Yasenchak states not for a small ground mount residential solar.

RESOLUTION; Kasselmann Solar

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: S. Weeks

RESOLVED: that the Planning Board approved Special Use Permit to Kasselmann Solar for ground mount solar panels to be located at 377 Lake Desolation Road, TM# 136.-1-2.12. The structure on the back of the panels from being black, brown, or dark gray that the material color will be as presented noting that they will not be seen from anyone offsite. The applicant has provided information about the power transmission and that there will be no advertising signs on the structure or on the site. There will be no lighting added to the site for the ground mount solar. There will be a minimal impact on the land because there will be no land clearing (that has already been done.) No substantial increase in storm water runoff and no inferior limited erosion. Very limited site gear on any additional residents adjacent to the applicant's property, noting that we have letters from neighbors in support of this project. There is no large scale pesticide, insecticide, or urbanite that will be used for this project. The maximum height of the project shall not exceed 15'.

All in Favor, motion granted.

SARATOGA POLO PUD AMENDMENT Site plan
Bloomfield Rd. Case# 581

Donald Zee, Peter Loyola, Jim Rossi, Mike Bucci, and Luke Michaels are present for the applicant. D. Zee states that the Town Board appeared to go along the water proposal they have come up with and they went in front of Saratoga County Water Authority last week. T. Yasenchak asks can you explain to the Board what other options the applicant has been investigated for acquiring water. T. Yasenchak states that the Town Board by reading their minutes they do have some hesitation about a water district for just one piece of property affecting too many other existing citizens so what other options have been investigated. D. Zee states 1 is the anisole project has presented before the Board and we receive site plan approval we have talked about using on site water source and there are more options and is still available to us. Second option is L. Michaels has spoken with the owners of Prestwick Chase they are at I believe 36,000 gallons of water a day through their private water system. We are in need of approximately 45,000 gallons per day and we have talked about buying a portion of their water I believe 26,000 was part of their excess utilization for the residential section and for the commercial property we would be using on-site so there would be a mixture. D. Zee states that because of the subdivision that we are proposing commercial would be one parcel and we wouldn't need to create a private transportation corporation, we would have on-site water for the commercial and acquire hopefully from Prestwick Chase approximately 26,000 gallons for the residential usage, so that are our 2 other options. D. Zee states that when we appeared before the Town Board as this Board was concerned about as we needed to revisit the PUD the plan that you see know is modified in 2 respects to be presented we have previously presented single family detached homes based on these interpretations by the Town Board as well as the Town Board attorney they thought that the intent of the PUD legislation was in fact to have multiple units in a structure as a result there is no single detached residents what so ever. D. Zee states that's one change that they made to the plan and that is after discussion with the Town Board and it was indicated in the Town Board minutes that with that modification they saw no reason why we needed to seek an amendment to the PUD. The other modification that we made to the plan is the fact that we created a separate and distinct lots for the condominium buildings, last time you saw this plan the condominium buildings were part of the Polo Field and we thought it was best for financing purposes as well as for maintenance purposes that be a separate and distinct lot, it's arguable like a flag lot frontage on Bloomfield Rd. and it goes back we have just increased the project by one additional lot we have not increased any additional units otherwise everything is the same. D. Zee states that they are pleased from their perspective and the Town Board was in agreement with us with the minor modifications with the elimination of the single detached family homes they did not believe that we needed any modification or amendment of the existing legislating of this project. D. Zee states that since our last appearance and based on the conversations we had at the last

workshop we have submitted a traffic study by Creighton Manning and in that traffic study it included the traffic that is anticipated based on the approved Prestwick Chase project and doesn't think they saw no additional litigation necessary based on the addition of this project. D. Zee states that one other thing that they have modified is the last time we were here we showed the easement area that we had with Skidmore and we included that in our calculations that has been removed though we do show where an easement area but, we don't show any improvements or any developments of the Skidmore easement area and those are outside our calculations, that was a concern raised by the Board. In addition to the traffic study we have submitted a detailed analysis showing the amount of the impervious surface because under the PUD can only be 20% impervious growth on this 42.7 acre parcel and he believes what is shown is 18.3% impervious surface. In addition the Board has requested showing the parking spaces, their exact location, and the number of parking spaces available and we have that on the plan as well. D. Zee states they have 624 parking spaces available and we have that on the plan as well. D. Zee states the some Board members at the last meeting have raised an issue to the trailers that carry the some of the horses and he just wanted to point out that based on our clients experience at this project of utilizing the Polo Fields there have been at the most 4 horse trailers. D. Zee states that we have existing shed building that we can park the trailers with the trucks in. D. Zee states that Mr. Rockel had raised an issue in the meeting about part of the attachments to the PUD legislation with regard to the fact that the units were to be furnished units and since we are the fractional interest have been defined agreement that a 52 week fractional interest is permitted we are able to have a model which has fully frontage and we show that and Luke Michaels of the Michaels Group says we will offer that to any part who purchases it to sell the them the comparable furniture but, you would think that someone spending in the range of \$400,000. Per unit they wouldn't want to have the same furnishings that all 58 units have they may wasn't to acquire something else so we would give them the opportunity to buy a furnished unit or we would give them an option to furnish it themselves. D. Zee states that he feels that they have addressed what is required for the appendances of the legislation. D. Zee states that the Board has raised issues of the appearance of the building and the use of certain natural materials and L. Michaels did meet with G. McKenna regarding that. D. Zee states that in addition there were questions in regard to school bus and L. Michaels had a discussions with the transportation department with the school system. D. Zee states that there was discussion about rear setbacks for this property and he wants to point out when the prior project was approved by the Town which included the larger store buildings that plan had the setback at 24'. T. Yashchak states for the accessory buildings. L. Michaels we have one building in the corner that was actually 24'. T. Yashchak states ok. D. Zee states that the setbacks the Planning Board had in fact admitted in the previous PUD was 24' we now have our setbacks 40' so we are increasing the setbacks from the previous plan, even for separate building to increasing the buffer from the adjacent properties by 16'. L. Michaels states that he brought the preliminary plans over to G. McKenna we ran through our typical 3 unit building and our typical 2 unit building and talked about where some natural materials will be used cedar trim, natural trim, to kind of pick up different colors throughout the project and the house and natural stone across the fronts of the buildings with those as well. G. McKenna thought that was a good way to mix in some natural materials as well. L. Michaels states that with regards to the school buses he spoke with Mel at the Saratoga School bus garage and she was happy that we approached her regarding the school buses. L. Michaels states that Mel explained that as long as the road is wide enough to allow two school buses pass by each other she would allow the school buses to drive on the site. Mel stated that the school buses in width are 8' mirror to mirror so with our 22' road provides plenty of space. L. Michaels states that as far as kids Mel stated the a school bus stop could be located on the site and as long as it's within 3/10th of a mile for an elementary school child and 1/2 of a mile for middle school child and 1 a mile for a high school child. L. Michaels states that's where we would locate those spot judging on the measurements of something up towards the front of the site or closer to the lower connected road would be a good location for them. L. Michaels said he also spoke with Ryan Burley the Greenfield Center post master it's Saratoga Springs post master but, he handles the delivery from Greenfield Center and he said he wanted to see a centralized mailbox and again that would be someplace up at the front of the site where a poll mailbox would be located where driver would come in drop off the mail loop around the site and come out the other side as long as he didn't have to put his truck into reverse. P. Loyola states that he is trying to get back to square one back to where we were in

2007, he wants to hand out the revised applications with site plan approval contingent on water, sewer, storm water and we think we are almost there with this. P. Loyola states that he wants to hand out a revised application because you did not have those within your submittal. P. Loyola states that it is based on the new subdivision so we have a new application, a new narrative that goes along with that updates all the sites statistics and the new application for the site plan. T. Yasenchak states that we will pass this around so that everyone gets one but, because we are getting it. P. Loyola states that there is site plan and subdivision. P. Loyola states that in addition he also wants to pass out a memorandum with regard to SEQRA. P. Loyola states that before we get into the memorandum and the site plan application he wants to go over the site statistics that we submitted to you folks and go through the square footage build out. P. Loyola states that if you have the site statistics in front of you 1 slight revision to the site statistics there was a typo at the very last line from lots that show on yours 4-61 that should have been relabeled 5-62 that we are purposing a 62 lot subdivision and he has 11 copies of the revised for you. Still 58 homes and D. Zee mentioned we took all of the calculations and we based them on the 42.7 form and we took the easement area completely out so everything we are talking about is within the PUD area. P. Loyola states that the square footage build out with the duplex and the triples 17 buildings are duplex 34 units there, triples are 8 buildings 24 units there, one or two story options. The total square footage for these units on the duplex is 91,800 maximum, these are based on a 27,000 square foot on an average unit including the garages and L. Michaels can elaborate a little more on the different variations and the different options regarding these units but, this absolutely the maximum we are going to need for the duplex and the triples. P. Loyola states there are going to be folks that will want 1 story and so that number will go down significantly, there are going to be a few people that will want 2 story so that we are going to commit to that 91,800 max and 64 and 800 max on the duplex and the triples and as you do the math coming down we are not going to exceed actually our build out is 381,000 248 square feet which is within the allowable limit for the PUD of 284 but, we do want to reserve the right for any future facility buildings and amenities that may pop up we have about 2,700 square feet there to round it out. P. Loyola states that at some range we have a total 184,000 maximum total square footage for build out for residential and then that leaves the commercial retreat lodge and new events hall which was previously approved intact. P. Loyola states the previously approved commercial building was actually a little bit less than 80,000 square feet but, the PUD can be greater than 80,000 square feet, higher than 38' so we meet the requirements there with PUD and essentially we are purposing exact same buildings as was previously approved, no changes to the square footage, total build out of the commercial 97,000 square feet. P. Loyola states that site statistics D. Zee mentioned 62 lots 4 lots and then each unit would actually be its own separate lot for a total of 62 lots. P. Loyola states we do a requirement for the 284,000 will be well within our PUD requirements. P. Loyola states that with regard to the impervious summary we calculated 18.3% impervious. P. Loyola states that how we got to this is the residential buildings, we included the duplexes, and this includes all the roofs any of the car ports we included a mailbox building and a bus stop building total for the impervious for the residential buildings 49,000 square feet. P. Loyola states that if you go down through the list we have surplus obvious of impervious. To get to that surplus we purpose that course pavement be used for the condominium area course pavement for the colored areas. Pours pavement for the commercial and the commercial parking lots. Loyola states that gives us plenty of leeway to add sidewalks to the retail and patios, well under the requirement of 20%. P. Loyola states that the traffic study he thinks that they provided all the information to get a site plan approval contingent on the water, the sewer, and storm water. P. Loyola states that we need confirmation from you folks that if we move forward with those aspects that this is going to get approved. P. Loyola states that we left off 2007 had a site plan approved. P. Loyola states that one thing he wants to point out is with regard to the setbacks. P. Loyola states that the previous plan did have one building in the back that was 24' he knows that based on the PUD that the setback requirements were allowed to be established by the Planning Board so obviously the last go around with this we were allowed 24'. P. Loyola states that he has copies of the previous setbacks and one of the buildings are 24' from the rear setbacks and the car port were 24' but, also the parking areas that were facing the rear of the property were 47' away there is the ability for people to park in and face the rear of the property at 47' away so anyone that could pull in to these car ports and the have the headlights in the direction of the rear property we are not purposing that we are creating back yard space most of the

buildings, only one unit is ant that is at 40' unit 57. P. Loyola states that he thinks unit 56 and unit 34 is not even 40' closer to 44'. S. Weeks asks 43' and 44'? P. Loyola states yes 43' and 44'. The other units are within 50' and 45' we wanted to advantage of the curvature of the road, so we put them closest to the road as possible. P. Loyola states that we are really talking about 1 building that is at 40' and the rest of the buildings are greater than 40'. P. Loyola states that he feels that they are satisfied with that. P. Loyola states that moving to the memorandum for SEQRA in light of the fact that we feel that this is in complete keeping with the PUD as was intended we a requesting a waiver to reopen the SEQRA from a current development. P. Loyola states that he has put together a list of why they feel that way purposed modification will not exceed the allowable threshold of any of the pieces of the PUD. P. Loyola states that there is no change to the environmental impacts or reduced impacts. In regard to air quality there are no changes to that. Ground or surface water quality obviously if we can tie in to municipal water obviously there is significant reduction in impact with town water, we don't have to go with onsite wells, there are vast amounts of water that are right at our finger tips at the property line the Town has been a maniple to creating a water district and working with the water authority. T. Yasenchak states that has not been determined. P. Loyola states no correct. P. Loyola states that at the Town Board meetings they have been at he feels that everyone is willing to make this work because it is so accessible it doesn't make any since not to have this. P. Loyola states that the waste and water still unchanged the best thing that has happened to us during this time is that they upgraded a line downstream from us on Kirby Rd. P. Loyola states that there have been no changes to the wetlands, no change to the noise impact, no change to the traffic impacts. We had a new traffic study with consideration to Prestwick Chase. No change to solid waste impacts. We are going to meet all the storm water requirements with the erosion, no change to the plants and animals impacts, no change to the current Town comprehensive plan or the neighborhood character. P. Loyola states that are scaling down on primarily single family homes. P. Loyola states that they would like to move this project forward. T. Yasenchak states the applicant doesn't feel that they have addressed the parking, you have given us an event parking diagram but, also when looking at the Lodge what you are proposing for your main parking lot only 25 parking spaces and everything else is listed as event parking and it's not additional driveways there's no lights no conductivity to the Lodge to the parking area. T. Yasenchak doesn't feel that there is significant enough parking for that Lodge to address that parking requirements that would be needed for employees as well as people who would be going to the Lodge. T. Yasenchak states that placing 45, 5 deep cars on the edge of a ravine within the 100' wetland buffer, I don't think is appropriate. D. Zee states that in regard to employee parking as well as the parking around the area we will have the ability to have valet parking. D. Zee states that if you go to a lot of these upscale resorts they have valet parking there are a lot of car hops, you drive up to the facility get out, give your keys to the attendant and we have the parking in the 5 deep as well throughout the site we will have arrangements for the car hop to move vehicles to these locations and obviously the employee bus you over to your vehicle. D. Zee states that happens at all upscale resorts. T. Yasenchak states that she doesn't doubt but, it's not counted in any impervious area, the way it was presented to us at the last meeting was that all this was event parking and there is a difference parking diagram and what your site plan should show, if you are having regular parking that is not going to be on the grass, it's going to need to have some kind of paver so that cars are not falling into the mud in the winter and again this area up to the west that is within the 100' wetland buffer and it is on the edge of a ravine how is all of that parking getting accommodated. T. Yasenchak states that she does not see this in this plan. P. Loyola states the plan is put together just to show there is more 600 parking spaces that are available during large events there is one corner where cars are parked there now that is a large area, it is flat, it is grassy, and if we need to stack folks up in this area we have plenty of area to stack folks here we can double load the Tailgate the point of that diagram was to show that there is in excess of 600 parking spaces last go around we talked about 300 spaces with regard to the Lodge and the permanent parking with the Lodge again valet and right it's being used for parking along the maintenance area we took out the easement area but, there is in fact available parking along the easement area and along the road all of this was going to be located as pours pavement so the only pervious surfaces is here well within the limits of supply for spa and of the daily events. P. Loyola states that we feel we can adequately address the parking. T. Yasenchak states that she doesn't and will ask the Board. T. Yasenchak states that when we look at a commercial project from the design

standpoint we ask for permanent parking to be addressed these are shown on grass not shown as any kind of structure underneath that and feels that it needs to be addressed whether it's valet or not the cars are being parked somewhere, whether they are in a wetland buffer. T. Yasenchak states these need to be addressed and that was not part of the original SEQRA or original site plan that we reviewed did show a large parking area that addressed employees and people who would be going to the Lodge, so that needs to be addressed a little bit more. T. Yasenchak states that she does not care how the cars get there, if they are driven by valet or the patron's park, the space needs to be designated so that we know that we are reviewing that part of the site plan. T. Yasenchak states that we have requirements for a number of parking spaces that are required. P. Loyola states one of the things that is happening with the commercial space we are looking at underground parking in the basement level provide a parking garage we know with the size of the building we can fit at least 60-80 cars if not more, that can easily go underneath the building. P. Loyola states that to hold this project up for commercial building is going to have to come before this Board what we are asking for is that you approve the site plan contingent on adequate parking for the Lodge that's reasonable. T. Yasenchak states for me to feel comfortable to review SEQRA which has to do with run off and it has to do with also a visual and I think I would need to see that, it's a significant difference between when we reviewed SEQRA and what we are looking at now, if that's where you feel you can put cars there then, I would like to see that plan and I feel that if there are parts of it now that need to be addressed that's all consistent I don't want to be backed into a corner in approving something and then someone comes back and says we don't have enough parking we want to use the field, and now the field is gone because that's where you want to put the parking. T. Yasenchak states that if you are going to do a Lodge of that size having 25 parking spaces in front of it is highly inadequate. T. Yasenchak states that she will need to see that addressed in the SEQRA form. D. Zee asks 25 parking spaces are not sufficient in your opinion? What number do you see as adequate because the hotel operator we have been talking to says it is? D. Zee states that he does not want to have a guessing game. T. Yasenchak states look at our underline zoning and see what we required for parking spaces for various uses. D. Zee states what he is saying is we have the number that is necessary throughout the site and we can meet it with valet parking, what I'm hearing from you specifically is that you want to see a certain number that you are comfortable with, within a relative proximity of the front door, the entrances. D. Zee states that they believe they have adequate parking according to our current zoning laws or according to what? T. Yasenchak states that any municipality will typically say for any type of use that you are doing whether it is a restaurant, or school, or hotel it says specifically this is how many parking spaces you should have. D. Zee states that we have 624 parking spaces. T. Yasenchak states that she doesn't think it is shown correctly on a site plan addressing SEQRA having 145 parking spaces within the 100' wetland buffer that is not something that they originally reviewed as part of SEQRA, your saying that nothing has changed in regards to SEQRA and wetlands and I disagree, and it's very specific. D. Zee states that there are two issues there, 1. You raise the issue of SEQRA and 2. You raise the issue of parking in certain proximity of the door. D. Zee states that his comment is that we believe that we have adequate parking more than adequate for the commercial operations a separable what I'm hearing are that you want a certain number. T. Yasenchak states that we are not going to give you that number right now today if you want a number look at the regulations/requirements for parking. D. Zee states that we need that number for parking in our 42.427 acre parcel we are going to provide that via valet parking. T. Yasenchak states that she doesn't care how the cars get there I'm saying that the parking lot that you are showing, what is the surface? T. Yasenchak states there are several other designs criteria that typically meant for a parking area also if that's going to be parked on a regular bases then it will need to be cleared, there will be storm water that has to be addressed with those issues, so that's what I'm saying is this needs specific designated parking for regular use that is not unusual for any type of commercial application. T. Yasenchak states that when it does come to SEQRA I feel you are showing designated parking in driveways within that 100' wetland buffer that is not something that we originally reviewed. T. Yasenchak states that she wants them to look at the wetland and how the development that you are purposing is being affected if any of that development is within that 100' wetland buffer does not seem to me that it goes through some of the development. P. Loyola states that was previously approved in 2007 so I guess what I'm getting at with the previous the way we approach this is that rather than having surface parking on a pervious surface parking it would be so far less of an impact to have the Polo park on

the grass we are providing grass pave for 160 cars along the tailgate side, this is being purposed as grass pave far better solution with green infrastructure practices to go pores. P. Loyola states that what was previous approved and what we are purposing now is far less impact in regard to storm water, it was never addressed that the valet parking was never addressed in the previous site plan because there was adequate parking all over the field and that's what we are purposing now after Polo events we have a whole big grass parking lot that can fit thousands of cars, literally thousands of cars so the permanence that you are looking for is actually going create more impact with regard to storm water, we rather go with grass, we would rather go with natural surfaces we are going to be using green infrastructure practices the storm water management is going to account for not only designated spaces but, for the valet pieces as well so it's a temporary condition that we have to meet here, but, we don't have to over design this and we don't want to over design it, it doesn't make since to over design it because the peak season is going to be during Polo with regard to the Lodge itself again the coming and going and what we are seeing for valet and what the folks are telling us is more than adequate for the boutique style of Lodge that we are purposing and in the summer time when it's at peak we have plenty of grass parking all over the place which would be far better than paved parking, so that's what we are talking about with regard to SEQRA and the impact of storm water far less impact doing this than building a big surface parking area. C. Baker states that's all fine and good for summer time events but, what about winter? P. Loyola states that you can plow grass or you can use grass pave. T. Yasenachak states that is an issue for me also as far as any kind of maintenance building small shed on the one property in the back were you are saying that you are planning on putting the trailers during Polo events but, is there any other kind of maintenance building or where will the maintenance vehicles be this is a lot that is being paved there is a lot that needs to be cut so where will all those vehicles be housed? T. Yasenachak asks is there another building here? P. Loyola states there is no other building that's necessary again the maintenance going to be underneath the commercial building. T. Yasenachak asks where the plows or trucks for landscaping and all of that to sit. L. Michaels states that it will most likely be a private contractor that comes onto the site once a week for mowing, and on storm situations. T. Yasenachak asks the Polo field seems to have come forward from the original design and it doesn't seem square. J. Rossi states that it is not square on that one of the entrances it does curve and it's always been there. T. Yasenachak states that this plan seems smaller than the original one it seems smaller that a regulation Polo field would be. T. Yasenachak states that it is listed as 440 x 890 a regulation size Polo field without the safety around the outside should be 900 x 480. T. Yasenachak states that the Polo field that is supposed to be saved and historical piece just continues to get smaller. P. Loyola states that it has not changed. T. Yasenachak states that it has changed from the original approved design. P. Loyola states that he thinks that they expanded out, and he doesn't think it did. P. Loyola states that the lines are shown and he thinks that they squared it up but, again this is not the historic field, the historic field is our plan. T. Yasenachak asks that what you have now is not the regular regulation? J. Rossi states it is just where the field was placed. P. Loyola states that we are utilizing and then we are doing an additional run out area of about 50' and again we are keeping the same configuration of the Polo field that's there, you can see the area underneath. T. Yasenachak asks what is the difference between what the regulation stance asks for. J. Rossi states that it is close to a regulation field although it did have that little turn in which we have lived with that has always been there. T. Yasenachak states that she had a hard time looking at the difference between your events parking diagram and the diagram that showed the road that goes along Bloomfield that's on your property, there seemed to be a disconnect or maybe I am reading it wrong so if you could explain that. P. Loyola states that T. Yasenachak states that on the event diagram shows the parking here and then on the plan that you submitted this plan shows the driveway so I didn't know maybe this parking was on the other side of that or where that was? T. Yasenachak states to really look and this is why I feel that we need to review SEQRA is because the appendix be that's part of the PUD does talk significantly about this being Lodge like that there would be open space looking over outdoor views gardens and open areas and so forth, there's a lot in appendix B that she feels was noted in our negative declaration and at the time of our negative declaration that was back in 2007. T. Yasenachak states that she feels that there issues that have been changed that no longer are along the intent of the appendix B and I won't list out all the reasons why just because of time. T. Yasenachak believes this needs to have a review so with that She asks the Board if they have additional questions that they would like to make. T. Yasenachak states the large item is

obviously the water whether if that is something that becomes an onsite water system with using part of Prestwick Chase then obviously that's a large impact on the environment where if at that point you are using onsite whether for Prestwick Chase from an onsite well what you are doing with sewer at that point again becomes a very large environment impact our Environmental Commercial agree with taking the waste water off site if you are using onsite water because then there is a difference in balance your using thousands of gallons of water onsite but, you are pumping it off site with the sewer and actually it has been shown in many cases and studies throughout NYS that, that does create in balance in the environment. T. Yasenchak states that is a substantial piece that needs to be figured out before we can really continue because that affects the SEQRA. M. Gyarmathy states the Lodge and the grand event hall I would like to see designated parking for that. M. Gyarmathy asks the road in the back by the residential and the road going in and out is narrowed to 22' during event times it is more important for the road to be wider especially for the residents in the back, can you explain that to me? M. Gyarmathy asks if there is going to be any lighting throughout the roadway system. P. Loyola states that there will be no street lighting at all, all the lighting will be on the residential just low level lighting then on the building there is low level lighting on the buildings, no street lights. M. Gyarmathy states that T. Yasenchak has covered his other two questions. Dr. Streit and J. Bokus both states that they do not have any additional questions. S. Weeks states that he feels the chair has covered a lot of things but, he has one question is that are the exterior of the units going to be a varying color? S. Weeks ask what the distance from the garages to the road is. L. Michaels asks do you mean the length of the driveways. S. Weeks states yes. L. Michaels states 20'-25'. S. Weeks states that they should be at least 25'. B. Duffney states that you said you were going to be putting the horse trailers out back by the shed and there are approximately four trucks with trailers per event? P. Loyola states that is correct. B. Duffney states that he took some measurements and states that the trucks with the trailer is approximately 50'-55' long between the truck and the trailer if you back them on grass you better have a tractor to pull them out if you are going to put them on grass. M. Gyarmathy asks have you ever had any issues with that before. J. Rossi states that they have had other issues with grass before but not in that area. J. Rossi states that he thinks they may have misspeak we had talked about possibly being more than four trailers the average is four. P. Loyola states that the maximum that we have ever had is four. B. Duffney states that he deals with tractor trailers and that he knows mud so it could be an issue depending on what you are doing I would say you would want to bring them up past the Lodge rather than the residential. B. Duffney states that if you are having a lot of events and the Retreat Lodge like weekends and we get a month of rain and you are trying to park on grass that should be addressed. P. Loyola states that they will designate out the grass pave because we really want to cut down on the impervious. M. Gyarmathy asks for some literature on grass pave, maybe we are not familiar enough with it. P. Loyola states that they use it at SPAC in their main parking lot. It's basically for over flow so you don't have to pave everything. L. Michaels states that they use on project for emergency access vehicles, fire trucks, ambulances, and all that it's impervious. B. Duffney asks what the use of the Retreat Lodge is. J. Rossi the original intent of the Lodge was all for fractional residences that would you would purchase for one to fifty two weeks and would also be rentable for nightly use. B. Duffney asks like a hotel? J. Rossi states that it would operate similar to a hotel but, some of the units may be owned by individuals. J. Rossi states they would have full kitchens; it would be for an extended stay. Ideally it would be used for people who are in Saratoga during the season who stay longer than the average tourist would stay. J. Rossi states we are thinking that it could also house a wedding party and so forth. B. Duffney asks how many rooms are in the Lodge approximately 60. B. Duffney states 60 rooms and you have 25 permanent parking spaces out front are all these people going to be able to go in and out with the valet parking at night? B. Duffney asks if there is going to be 24 hour valet parking at night if someone wants to go out with 60 rooms and you have 25 parking spaces. D. Zee states that we would be in the service industries we would be servicing the owners the people they are dealing with are very familiar with needs of the people they are seeking to come here, that's why the fact that you have valet parking is a plus. P. Loyola states that outside of a Polo event and that is what that diagram was for to show that when Polo is in session, when polo is not in session we have 160 parking spaces in the tailgate area that is grass pave so the thought was that valet would park over there and we would service the parking area of the tailgate area. P. Loyola states that when Polo is in session we have valet. B. Duffney asks for literature on the grass pave as well. T. Yasenchak

states that all the employees in the Lodge are not going to be valeted. T. Yasenchak asks will they just be parked on the outside so they can get out when they are done. D. Zee states that when you go to an upscale resort the employees do park a half of mile away and they are bused back and forth they come in specific shifts. D. Zee states that my clients and are familiar with these type of operations. B. Duffney asks how many times a year and how many people will attend the event hall. P. Loyola states that were in the original proposal, the banquet facility will seat 300. D. Zee states that we will put all this in a narrative. B. Duffney states J. Rossi the reason he is asking these questions is so you can cover it, so when you do come back you have everything covered, this is why I am questioning so you will know what our concerns are. B. Duffney states that he isn't trying to be hard on anyone he's just trying to do his job. B. Duffney asks you think you will be using 35,000 gallons of water per day? P. Loyola states 45,000 per day that's maximum use. D. Zee the 35,000 is what Prestwick Chase is permitted and we anticipate that the residential will use 26,000 and the rest will be the commercial aspect. B. Duffney states that the sewer line comes down by Prestwick Chase and goes across and goes into the county is that line going to be big enough for what you are purposing to use for water and what Prestwick Chase is already using? P. Loyola states that first of all there is no water line what so ever on Denton Rd. and anything that would be agreed upon by Prestwick Chase it's early in discussion but, so the thought was we could utilize some access capacity again whether that comes about or not to me it's probably the least feasible and when you have 36" water line with a water valve already here so we just have to work out the semantics and the logistics. P. Loyola states the sewer will go in and tie not to Prestwick Chase at all by just on the other side of the road to an 8" there is more than enough to pass it 10" force main goes to the 10" then it goes to gravity then it goes to the 16". B. Duffney asks the line is big enough for Prestwick Chase and your project? P. Loyola states yes, we have met with Grant Eaton and he has agreed to take over the whole distribution system and we provided him with a subdivision plan, easements that they require for that and they are on board. P. Loyola states we are pretty far along in terms of the lay out and the details that they want to see, they will take the distribution lines over up to pumps. T. Yasenchak asks why the Polo field was left out as a separate lot. T. Yasenchak states why not include that if you are only allowed for your build out of structures and you had 28,000 why were that left out? Why that wasn't enveloped somewhere else? D. Zee states that it is difficult for financing when you go to the bank and ask to finance commercial building and a Polo field. There is also discussion about creating a not for profit 501C3 entity that may own the Polo field. D. Zee states that he has mentioned to the Town Board as well as this Board that we want to talk about having a long term plan for the usage of the Polo field and when you start mixing the Polo field with a condominium building they don't necessarily agree with the 16 units, there is going to be a condominium association. D. Zee states how many people on condominium association really care about this Polo field? That's why we separated that; commercial building may in the long run may not care about it. D. Zee states that J. Rossi and M. Bucci are very concerned about the Polo field and want to make sure that it is protected. D. Zee states this tiff one of the entities fails we won't lose the Polo field. T. Yasenchak asks there will be easements for parking and so forth? T. Yasenchak asks that you have a lot that pretty much can't be built on because you are only allowed another 28,000 sq. ft. for build out so why would someone want to own a field or what would the incentive be for someone to own a something that couldn't be built on? D. Zee states that it can't be built on currently but, if something were to happen and the market places change dramatically and all of a sudden Saratoga High School decides that they want to buy this field for purposes of having a football stadium because they are the #1 football team in the state for 10 yrs. In a row. D. Zee states that what happens then they will come back to the Town and say that they want to buy it. They will have to go get zone change and amend the PUD. D. Zee states that they don't want that to be impacted by the condominiums, and the commercial it's a standalone lot and he feels that's the best way to protect the integrity of the Polo field. J. Rossi states that a field of that size needs to exist to play Polo on it and to make sure that the field was indiscreet. T. Yasenchak states that she understands that but, it seem that if it was attached to something else someone would have the incentive to maybe pay taxes on it be knowing that it is part of a larger operation, if it's set aside than that great event hall obviously you would have cross easements but, then why would the Town want to ever own that. T. Yasenchak states that she doesn't know what the reasoning would be to have just a lot by itself? P. Loyola states it's a fantastic open space. T. Yasenchak asks again why the Town want would own it. D. Zee states that because the Polo field id

separate from the operation, it's going to have separate numbers and separate banks, we have separate operators. T. Yasenchak states that people that are going to the Polo field are sitting on one piece of property; again I don't understand the reasoning behind it. T. Yasenchak asks how the square footage of the buildings will be kept track of. Is that something that Building Dept. will have to keep track of? T. Yasenchak states that she does not see the Building Dept. every time you bring in a building maybe this is a contingency that we work on down the road when we take action. D. Zee states that when we get a building permit along with that application you total up the previous building's sq. ft. have a list. D. Zee states that it is also now in the per view of the Planning Board and the per view of the Building Dept. to address what the Zoning code and what the approval is, it's very simple that way. T. Yasenchak states that some of these units have changed slightly depending on who wants to buy them. L. Michaels states that we have a maximum there of 2,700 that includes the garage which is typically 400 sq. ft. so that would leave 2,300 sq. ft. of livable area, our units are going to range from 1,300 to 2,000 sq. ft. normally and that gives play for people to maybe finish their basement. L. Michaels states that our most popular plan and best seller in this is a 1,600 sq. ft. unit and that's just average numbers just to give you an idea. J. Bokus states that he heard a statement about fractional ownership are these houses going to have one owner per house or you going to own it weeks? D. Zee states that the town homes themselves will most likely have one owner. T. Yasenchak states that you mentioned fractional ownership in the Lodge. D. Zee in the Lodge and possibly in the condo buildings. T. Yasenchak states that you said there will be 60 rooms in the Lodge that's not 60 suites that's 60 rooms or residential units if there is fractional ownership in the Lodge is there potential to having 60 potential livable fractional units residence in there. D. Zee states yes. D. Zee states that they have not finalized those plans most commercial entities don't wasn't to come forward and talk about the project until we get beyond the stage that we are at now. T. Yasenchak states that there is some sort of catch 22 there in order for us to review we need to have some over view. D. Zee states that because we are limited by the number of sq. ft. P. Loyola states that the beauty of the PUD is that it was flexible to allow a little variation without jeopardizing the intent. P. Loyola states that go around you guys did was done really well and it allowed some flexibility for the housing type and for meeting those thresh holds. D. Zee states that you have indicated that if there are any residents here that want to speak with regard to any of the projects at that point and time will there be a dialog there? T. Yasenchak states no because we don't have a public hearing on your particular project if a neighbor would like to come and speak it's a time where they would just present the Board with their comments but, there is typically no dialog even during a public hearing there is no dialog back and forth it's just a time where we receive information so if you feel like you would like to stay for that time please feel free. T. Yasenchak states one other thing for the Board none of the Board members noted your preference for reopening the SEQRA if you feel that you have enough information or do you feel that we should reopen the SEQRA or do you feel that we would be able to do a review without reopening it or asking for a new SEQRA form? J. Streit states that he would be comfortable if the Town attorney addressed that. T. Yasenchak states that he cannot he will advise us on the process but, the determination of whether or not we as a Board feel we have enough material. J. Streit states that he means they present it and the attorney suggested that they went to the Town Board and that the 3 questions that we had, had been given permission by the Town Board that it was compatible with the PUD previous approval if the Board is able to his comments were correct and the Town Board did prove that that would alleviate any need to pursue a new PUD language as far as the SEQRA let the Town attorney be able to comment on his comments that he has printed information about why they feel that the SEQRA questions now are all less than previously stipulated ones of the SEQRA can the Town attorney rule on that? T. Yasenchak states that she can answer both your questions. D. Zee states that he feels it is premature to talk about SEQRA right now because the members of the Board are asking us to answer and provide additional information and there may be a possibility after we submit the additional information that the Board could determine that SEQRA may not be necessarily have to be open. T. Yasenchak states let me answer back to my Board member to two ways and why I am going to say this is Mr. Zee is because if the Board tonight says they feel that they are leaning towards SEQRA it will actually give you the opportunity to address that with us and not have to maybe waste another couple of weeks so it's really in your interest. T. Yasenchak states that she is going to answer that first question, the Town Board did an interview say that from an interest that we needed review amended PUD language so unless there is some

other interpretation or unless the Board has questions for the Code Enforcement Official to look and review the PUD for consistency unless we ask him right the answer to that PUD and is consistent within the PUD as far as the SEQRA our Town attorney will not answer that question because it is our per view as a Board to review the information that has been given to us from the applicant and the materials and see if we feel as a Board we need to reopen SEQRA it's not something that the Town attorney will say that based on this information you should reopen it is within our Boards per view to say we feel that there has not been significant enough change we feel that a negative declaration will still stand for these reasons or if we feel that there is a significant change in how we review SEQRA or the information that we are reviewing has to do with SEQRA then we would say we feel that we need a revised SEQRA document from the applicant then we would reopen and review SEQRA. J. Streit thanks T. Yasenchak for the clarification. T. Yasenchak states that because of this she asks the Board do you about SEQRA just so that the applicant will know how you are leaning and if you feel that the applicant can provide additional information that would help you say you do not feel you have to open it. S. Weeks feels he cannot make a decision on that at this time he feels he needs to see what the final plan looks like and then compare that to what was approved in 2007 and then decide. T. Yasenchak states that we do have a copy of the negative declaration have been distributed to the Board. B. Duffney states that one thing that you pointed out earlier with the parking and the 100' wetland area that would be one thing we would go back to SEQRA for. M. Gyarnathy states he agrees with S. Weeks and B. Duffney and that he wasn't on the Board in 2007 so he does not feel he has enough information to answer that question at this time. J. Streit we have also just been given their argument why so I haven't had time to process it. J. Bokus states that it would be in our best interest to see what additional information they bring forward. T. Yasenchak asks if they have any additional questions for the Board.

Witt Construction

Minor Subdivision
Lester Park Road

J. Bokus states that he is adjacent property owner and is recusing himself from this project. Katy Gail is present for the applicant. K. Gail states that this is a four lot subdivision; it does say that the project is on Lester Park Rd. but, it is on Middle Grove Rd. T. Yasenchak states are you taking one lot and making it into four lots. T. Yasenchak states that one lot is 17.874 acre and you are showing two different options K. Gail states John Witt has two thoughts and wants to know what the Board thinks of them. T. Yasenchak states that lot 2 has 6.459 acres lot 3 has 7.827 acres and lot 10.135 acres and lot 4 is kind of an L shaped lot. T. Yasenchak states that there are significant wetlands on this property that the applicant has shown and the lots and the driveways are shown and are out of the wetland. T. Yasenchak asks if K. Gail can speak a little bit on why J. Witt has proposed the two different options, and as we go forward with this project we ask for sight distances to be shown at the driveway locations to meeting aster standards. T. Yasenchak states that we have found that shared driveways don't make good neighbors, so was there any other reason behind him wanted to have that purposed. K. Gail states not that she is aware of. T. Yasenchak asks if you need any DEC or ARMY COR permits. K. Gail states that we had soil scientists go survey the wetlands and he found that they are both DEC and ARMY COR, we will have to at least do a jurisdictional determination request from the ARMY COR. T. Yasenchak states that you may not need any permits for disturbance, it seems to me that the purposed driveways and homes are outside the wetlands but, they would just have to look at lot 4 making sure that the driveway was out of the 100' wetland buffer. S. Weeks my main question is the two options on the driveways, we try to stay away from them whenever we can in many cases it may be advantageous for the developer but, not so adventitious for the home owners down the road. B. Duffney agrees with S. Weeks shared driveways sight distance that's one of the main things especially in that area coming down that hill vehicles move pretty quickly. B. Duffney asks if the lot frontage meets. T. Yasenchak states yes 150' and that they all met that. M. Gyarmathy agrees with both S. Weeks and B. Duffney with the shared driveways what's the easement that goes through lot 4 is that for

the parcel that is behind? T. Yasenchak states that she guesses that it states existing asphalt driveway going into the adjacent property that is owned by the Waldron's and maybe when that driveway was put in over the property line, that's what it appears to me. M. Gyarmathy asks that the driveway was put in over the property line? T. Yasenchak it does say existing asphalt driveway and it looks like it is over the line. M. Gyarmathy asks does it go all the way to the back. T. Yasenchak no not that just the curved part, if you drive past that particular piece of property the driveway actually curves in. T. Yasenchak states that just the curved part is the driveway going into the adjacent property so giving the easement actually to the neighbor already has a driveway in. T. Yasenchak states that it does seem like there would be an easement at Middle Grover Road because of that driveway already being over the property line but, it does seem to note map references, to future private drives. T. Yasenchak asks would that driveway go anywhere else. T. Yasenchak asks if K. Gail can investigate on that the map reference to note that those go to a phase 2 subdivision. T. Yasenchak states that it could be amended if it is all on the same property. J. Streit states that he also dislikes shared driveways. T. Yasenchak states that as you go forward if you continued with revised drawings just so that you know the driveway that would come down in lot 4 any driveway once we have over a certain amount of length we do require pull offs for emergency vehicles, we also require signage right now it looks like it is already 700' that should be something that gets incorporated in. K. Gehl asks how often you need a pull off. B. Duffney states every 500', 12 ft. wide by 30'-32' long. T. Yasenchak and at the purposed home we would also need some kind of turnaround in case if an emergency vehicle did go back there they can turn around and pull forward. C. Baker states that he seems to remember this subdivision many years ago and looking at the map references does this subdivision already exist on this property? C. Baker states that he remembers Larry Benton and his son came in and her son presented it and there were a number of lots on Lester Park Rd. and Middle Grove Rd. I'm just wondering if maybe it never was followed through. C. Baker states that just looking at the map reference it just does not seem to make since. T. Yasenchak states that it all referencing back to 1997 to a specific map. C. Baker states that we don't have that map. T. Yasenchak asks if K. Gehl could look into that. C. Baker states that other than that the sight distances as you have already mentioned. T. Yasenchak states that if you are going to be submitting any revised materials if that can be to us 1 week before our meeting and you would be on the next workshop meeting so we are looking at a 2 week turn around.

Jesse Lena

Minor Subdivision
Wilsey Road

Jesse Lena is the present as the applicant for a minor subdivision on Wilsey Road. T. Yasenchak states that her company has in the past worked with J. Lena on projects and we don't have any pending projects with him currently, also he does not worked directly with her he has worked with her father. T. Yasenchak states that she feels she can review this project without any biasness and second of all we don't seem to have an application so there are 2 questions and we are going to have you explain the project slightly. T. Yasenchak just received this application and we do have an application requirement of 10 days prior to the meeting so we have time to review it. T. Yasenchak states that we are not going to have a discussion on this tonight we are very firm about that 10 day rule, we have made other projects come back and I'm going to stick to that. T. Yasenchak states that it is not fair to the Board to be getting applications

the day of the workshop meeting, it also says in our application it's required 10 days ahead of time. J. Lena states that he has a little over 6 acres looking to subdivide keyhole lot style. J. Lena states that there will be roughly 100' of frontage there my remaining house and parcel would be to the right and there will be a buildable lot to the left. T. Yasenchak asks if that is already a land locked parcel. J. Lena states yes has contacted the owner on that has passed away they are in North Carolina so he is still trying to reach them not sure if there is any interest in them selling or not. T. Yasenchak states that they will look at and as she has mentioned they have a 10 day our next workshop meeting is the second Tuesday of the month. J. Lena states that the reason G. McKenna said he could come was to try to get some feedback I could get from now to the next 2 weeks so I could try to get something together for then. T. Yasenchak states that the next workshop meeting is March 14, 2017 so you can provide us with any other additional information that you like but, that is about all I can say. T. Yasenchak states that we do have requirements in our code that list what we need to see for a subdivision obviously we like to see a survey, the survey will show us what the setbacks are and how big of a buildable space you actually have and we do as you probably heard we always ask for sight distance to make sure that the driveway is in a safe location and meets asphalt standards. J. Lena asks site distance? T. Yasenchak states yes site distance from the driveway. T. Yasenchak states that you will be back on the next workshop meeting.

ZBA REFERRAL

ZBA Referral for Carl & Marianne Gage for an Area Variance on Bocks Road. T. Yasenchak states that is for placement of their garage and the reasoning behind this is that they would have to move the driveway and also the house exists so for them to move the garage to meet Zoning setbacks it would be a difficulty and a hardship because of the existing driveway and house. T. Yasenchak asks the Board members if they have any questions. No Planning Board issues with this project.

T. Yasenchak states that if there is anyone here who would like to speak about anything or address the Board just let us know who you are and we don't have any public hearings open it's just a time for you to address the Board and make comments. T. Yasenchak states that if it is about a particular project obviously that would be a public hearing that will be open at some time. Will and Tabitha Orthwein are present and are the property owners of 100 Acre Farm directly north of Saratoga Polo the PUD project. W. Orthwein states that he understands that it is not public hearing but, just wants to inform the Board that there are some concerns that should probably be on their radar. W. Orthwein states that they have followed the PUD closely as the primary impacted neighbor of this project who was very involved with this project in 2004 & 2005 when this project first came up us. W. Orthwein states that they have worked with the sponsor in the past in fact they submitted a letter in support of the PUD back in 2005 showing that we thought it was a good idea because it preserved the Polo field and the neighborhood in the character that we felt was in keeping with the goals of both Polo and the Board and the neighborhood, unfortunately we don't feel that the current project is of those same standards. W. Orthwein states that there have been a lot of changes since the initial project was looked at and since SEQRA was reviewed and Negative declaration was made in 2005. W. Orthwein states that we were at the Town Board this February 9, 2017 and we asked the Town Board if an amendment was required and they were very clear saying that's up to the Planning Board and tonight we are hearing that the sponsor stated that the Town Board said that they were fine with it but, what the Town Board is making clear is that you all to decide if an amendment is required it's not that they did rule study the fractional ownership issue and they feel that by making duplexes they have complied with fractional ownership standards but, he wants to make it very clear that

he wants to sign off and say no amendment is required with Town Board said was that if the Planning Board wants an amendment they will ask for it. W. Orthwein states that going back to the original PUD the most fundamental issue with PUD is that the original PUD clearly states 60 residence within 5 residential structures that is original SEQRA. W. Orthwein states currently they have 74 residential units as in with the 27 residential structures and now the Lodge that they are purposing which was originally to be 10 fractional ownerships is now 60 hotel rooms that is not in any way the same project that they purposed 10 years ago that is a fundamental change in the primary use that is not outlined in the SEQRA document. W. Orthwein states that is not in any way the same project from 5 structures to 27 from 60 residence to 74 from 10 units to 60 in the Lodge the total impact of almost doubling the number of residence in this project. W. Orthwein states that is a primary concern for us. W. Orthwein states that in reading the PUD document the Planning Board and we worked very closely with the Planning Board and they put a lot of time and work into this they were very specific there was not ambiguity in what they were allowing in SEQRA or the PUD. W. Orthwein states that the Planning Board is the lead agency was designated as the lead agency in this regard so the PUD also states that if there are any changes that have an environmental impact then the Planning Board as lead agency you must rescind the approval of the negative declaration, if you don't then you must at least amend the SEQRA document. W. Orthwein states that you need to review that SEQRA document closely. T. Orthwein states that this negative declaration is different from P. Loyola's version; it's an annotated copy of the original negative declaration. W. Orthwein states that there primary concern is the number of residence which has nearly doubled. T. Ysenchak asks for additional copies. W. Orthwein states that the other concerns that he has is that this does not conform to the PUD and that is clear in the number of residences. W. Orthwein states that because there is no mapping of this area with regard to the flood zone I look at the Town zoning code to see what it said and the zoning code with regard it states very clear The insurance rate map of Saratoga are list and list every map that they have but, doesn't list the map of this zone again that is 0431. W. Orthwein states FEMA never issued that map because there was so few people that they elected not to make that map. W. Orthwein states the designation of Local Administrator and the Planning Board is here by appointed the Local Administrator with regard to flooding. W. Orthwein states The Local Administrator When basement elevation are not available to the Local Administrator Planning Board may use the flood information from any other authorized source such as historical data to establish flood elevations within areas of special flood hazard for purposes of this chapter. W. Orthwein states that it is up to the Planning Board to determine where this flood zone is because it is uncertain. W. Orthwein can show where it has flooded his driveway and the elevation of his driveway it's 334' above sea level you can use a topographical map to see where that falls but, someone has to do a study before you start building \$400,000. Homes 30 or 40 of them in this flood zone region. W. Orthwein states that it is not going to do the Michaels Group any good if they face a law suit, then they can come back to the Planning Board and say you approved it. W. Orthwein states that he feels strongly that someone needs to do a flood study before homes are built. W. Orthwein states that other places in Greenfield where there is established flood zone there is a 500' buffer from the center line of the creek and outlined in the flood district later on in the Zoning Code. T. Orthwein states since the largest Beaver damn broke that caused the most damage it significantly changed level of activity in that creek line we cross that creek several times a day on our driveway. T. Orthwein states that more frequently it is at capacity or moderately over it's not nearly as sleepy as it was. W. Orthwein states that if you look at the picture of my driveway that elevation of south of it is what typically floods when they have these events. W. Orthwein states that this is a frequent occurrence and the topography of this is extremely low especially where they are purposing these houses. W. Orthwein states that the residential housing does not meet the original application they left DEC wetlands unmarked and the 100' buffer zone not shown, they are building in an established flood zone. T. Orthwein states the dramatic increase of spectators at the Polo events when this property was purchased and the attendance for the Polo games in 2005 was somewhere between 10-13,000 people this past summer there were 16-18 different Polo events that had about 40,000 spectators for these games. T. Orthwein states that the opening game had 1,000 people in attendance the Labor Day game was sold out with the maximum capacity being listed as 3,500 people. T. Orthwein states that an average of 3 people per car which is what the previous study estimated that is 3,500 in spectators and 1,167 cars. T. Orthwein states that she feels it is a parking concern and an elevated noise concern the previous studies estimated a

crowd of 800 people as the maximum at a Polo game. C. Baker could you repeat yourself I thought you said 10's of thousands of people. W. Orthwein states that were back in 2005 and you're saying this year is 4,000-5,000? T. Orthwein states no 40,000 last year there was 40,000 spectators. W. Orthwein states with the maximum attendance are 3,500. W. Orthwein states that also with regard to site plan and parking, the trailers are 50' long but we tie horses on either side of them probably so probably 15' on either side of the trailer because they tie the horses outside of the of the trailer. W. Orthwein states that the trailer parking takes up a lot of space we do have a minimum of 4 but, typically we have 6 trailers per game. W. Orthwein states that the trailer parking has to be addressed. T. Orthwein states that typically they would drive 2 trailers ourselves and there could be as many as 10 would be the maximum. W. Orthwein states that for SEQRA the soils in that area have been misclassified the SEQRA application states that there are moderately drained soils they are the poorest drained classification of soils in the county the SEQRA has an error in that regard, on the long form it's not shown on the short form they poorly drained soils also they have 2 acres of porous pavement in their project but, porous has higher maintenance it clogs if you put sand on it and it does not work well in poorly permeated soils it's designed to absorb moisture if the moisture doesn't drain into the ground. W. Orthwein states that to us that have storm water bases that discharge into Putnam Brook which is a trout stream with violation of other environmental concerns none of the storm waters are allowed to discharge into the trout stream. T. Orthwein states that their sewer plan crosses Putnam Brook and SEQRA specifically says there will be no wetlands disturbed in the implementation of the sewer or water utilities. W. Orthwein states that SEQRA they can have 2 storm water basins their current plan has 5. W. Orthwein states that there is also a storm water basin at the end of the field. W, Orthwein states that he would like to compare this to having a storm water basin right behind the finish line at the Saratoga track can you imagine going full speed at the track and then having a drainage ditch at the end of it? W. Orthwein states that you cannot put a drainage basin on the Polo field. T. Orthwein states its right behind the north line. W. Orthwein states that they also made the field smaller it's not regulation size it has shifted to the south. W. Orthwein states that they have double parked cars and no spectator area but, they have cars parked bumper to bumper against the bourse and they can't leave unless they have to move someone else, people behind them can't see the field there is no grandstand for the spectators to park behind the other cars to get out and walk from. W. Orthwein states that there are a lot of issues with the site plan. W. Orthwein states that we are going to be coming to a lot of these meetings and he really doesn't want to tie up anyone's time we are trying to just focus on what we feel are the big issues the flooding, the number of residence, and the unmarked DEC wetlands but, there are a lot of issues with this project that are going to need to be reviewed. W. Orthwein states that we support the project and not opposed to the development of this site but, we like the vision that they had 12 years ago this is a drastically different project. T. Orthwein states that the only answer for a development and preservation of Polo and the neighborhood and sustainability but, this is not vision that was approved in 2005 this is a new vision that at minimum needs amendment and if they want a new vision they go through process that has due process that we can all be thoughtful and not rush. T. Orthwein states that the minutes from the last 3 meeting where they have representation whether at Town Board or Planning Board said hurry up you have to hurry up or they are going to go into foreclosure, we have to save Polo. T. Orthwein states that D. Zee polo is not even connected to what we are doing here, it's a separate entity. T. Orthwein states that was not the concept phase 1 was developed Polo and the amenities and the luxury structure the creek that brings people in, phase 2 was building the residence this is exactly the opposite and there is no guarantee phase 2 has any support. T. Ysenchak states that anything that you have presented to us will be at Town Hall for anyone to come and look at. T. Ysenchak asks if the Board has any other business. C. Baker states no.

Meeting adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Kimberley McMahon

DRAFT

DRAFT