

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD

July 10, 2018

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, Stanley Weeks, Butch Duffney, Charles Dake, John Bokus, Michael Gyarmathy and Karla Conway, Alternate. Robert Roeckle is absent. Gerry McKenna Building Inspector/Codes Administrator is present. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer, is present.

MINUTES – June 12, 2018

Minutes will be reviewed at next meeting

MINUTES – June 26, 2018

Minutes will be reviewed at the next meeting

OLD BUSINESS

Lochner, Thomas & Jill Case # 614
TM# 151.20-1-19.1

Special Use Permit
8 Liberty Drive

Thomas Lochner is present. T. Yasenchak states that T. Lochner was here at the last meeting and the Board had questions regarding the septic system; whether or not T. Lochner needs one or two septic systems. Our Town Code states that for the garage apartment they need two septic systems. However, the Board does have a letter from the Town Code Enforcer that states that the intent of the garage apartment section of the code was a stand-alone structure, that if necessary could be subdivided. In this particular case the existing garage apartment is planned to be connected to a newly proposed house by a breezeway separated by a new house existing garage apartment by 12+/-'. Which would eliminate the possibility of subdividing the garage apartment from the house. The septic system was designed for the total proposed use with six bedrooms Mr. Manz P.E. sufficient capacity with for the proposed use by (see file). He has provided the Board with a plan. Mr. McKenna continues that a second septic system would not be beneficial to the Town or the Applicant and therefore would not be necessary. T. Yasenchak asks G. Mc Kenna if he has any other comments on that from the way the Zoning Code is written. G. McKenna states that since the garage it is connected by the breezeway there is no possibility of subdividing the property and does not feel they need a second septic tank. T. Yasenchak states this is a Special Use Permit and the Board has requirements that the Board is bound to ask. Some may or may not be applicable. The Application process states that they should hold a Public Hearing. T. Lochner asks if the last meeting was his Public Hearing, why do they need another one. The person that ran the

meeting is not present tonight. T. Yasenchak apologizes. She opens the Public Hearing at 7:08 p.m. and no one is present to comment and there is no correspondence. She closes the Public Hearing at 7:09 p.m. The Board reviews the requirements for a Special Use Permit.

RESOLUTION: T. Lochner Case #614

MOTION: C. Dake
SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, the Town of Greenfield Planning Board, Case #614, TM# 151.20-1-19.1, grants approval of Special Use Permit for a garage apartment for Jill and Thomas Lochner, 8 Liberty Drive, per the plans submitted and acknowledging that the Board has a letter from the Building Inspector addressing the septic design with one septic system not two being required.

Ayes: Bokus, Dake, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Weeks, Yasenchak, and Conway
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Roeckle

NEW BUSINESS

VanGelder, J. Case #616
TM# 110.-1-22

Minor Subdivision
420 Ballou Road

Joseph VanGelder is present. T. Yasenchak states that this is a Minor Subdivision at 420 Ballou Road. J. VanGelder states that awhile back he started this and then stopped. This was approved awhile back but he never did anything with it. The Lot Line Adjustment that he did the school district line was not appropriate. They called him and asked him if he wants to continue with it and he said no. He said he should have continued with it. It has been approved once so he is hoping it will be approved again. He has two houses on one property. They are living in the farm house. It is his understanding that they cannot have more than one residence on one property. T. Yasenchak states correct. His plan is to eventually continue to work on the other house and move into that one when it is completed. J. VanGelder states that he has 99.9 acres. T. Yasenchak questions that as part of that subdivision is he proposing to modify the road in that area so that it is adequate. J. VanGelder states no, he did want to do that at the time, because of the road frontage. It was expensive and the Town would not do it. T. Yasenchak states that maybe the map that J. VanGelder is showing the Board is the one with the extended turn around, because when you look at the center of the turn around there is a little paved area in there. J. VanGelder states that they were thinking of doing that at the time, but it did not happen. T. Yasenchak states that what is shown on the map is not the case. J. VanGelder did survey it to have that done. They found out it was going to be \$150,000.00. The Town did not want to pay for and neither did I so that is the way it was left. He was willing to give the land that was needed to do it. B. Duffney asks if he just has the turn around and the pole. T. Yasenchak states that it is a T that is shown on the inset. J. VanGelder states that he has a 60' tractor turn around there. T. Yasenchak states that the map will have to be revised, if the map that they are looking at is not showing the existing conditions. J. VanGelder asks how it is now. T. Yasenchak states and then how it would be proposed so the Board will know exactly what the frontage will be. You will have to have a design professional/surveyor whoever

did that. J. VanGelder states that Dave Barss did this one. T. Yasenchak states that he is retired. G. McKenna states that Darrah Surveying bought D. Barss' business. C. Dake asks if this project is on Bockes or Ballou Road. J. VanGelder states Ballou Road. C. Baker states that he feels the Board needs something from Walt Barss, Highway Superintendent, to confirm that this is going to be a cul-de-sac. That is the way it was approved originally. If it has changed then the Board will need something from him. T. Yasenchak asks K. McMahon to please forward a copy of the plan to the Highway Superintendent. J. VanGelder states if W. Barss wants to put a turn around there he would be happy. T. Yasenchak states what the Town Engineer is saying is that the Applicant is increasing the density of the traffic on that road. The Board does always ask the Highway Superintendent whether or not the road needs to be improved. It is something in our Zoning Regulations that states the Board needs to ask him, making sure that the driveway is Code Compliant. That way the Board can get that ball rolling while he gets the survey. The Board does not have to have a Public Hearing with a Minor Subdivision for something that has already been approved. She asks the Board how they feel regarding a Public Hearing. The Board members concur. C. Baker asks for a copy of the original approval for W. Barss and himself. J. VanGelder states that if W. Barss wants to do a turn-around he is all for it. C. Baker states that normally the Town does not do the improvement, the Applicant does. J. VanGelder states he would pay for half. T. Yasenchak, states the Board will wait to see what W. Barss says. Perhaps dependent on W. Barss response the Board may have to produce some negotiations. If he can work on getting the Board an updated map, that is what the Board will need to move forward with this case. J. VanGelder states that he can speak with W. Barss himself. T. Yasenchak states that the Board is always welcoming communication. The Board will have a formal letter sent so they have that paper trail, but he is always welcome to talk to W. Barss. J. VanGelder states that he wanted to redo the whole hill. It is very steep. The Town Highway Department did pave it. It is treacherous going up in the winter. T. Yasenchak states that the Board needs to have any old business in 7 business days before the next meeting. The Board will wait on response letter from W. Barss.

Ziehnert, G. Case #618
TM# 151.-1-30.2

Special Use Permit
South Greenfield Road

Glenn Ziehnert is present. T. Yasenchak states this for a Special Use Permit on South Greenfield Road. G. Ziehnert states that he is looking to have an air bnb in his residence. He is not sure if the Board is familiar with air bnb, but they are very successful in the Town of Saratoga and throughout the country. He feels they are very fortunate to be in the country setting and he thinks it would be something for our area. T. Yasenchak asks if he will be using one bedroom. G. Ziehnert states yes, just the one bedroom. T. Yasenchak asks how many bedrooms do he have. G. Ziehnert states that he has three bedrooms. T. Yasenchak states that she wants to thank G. Ziehnert for applying for a Special Use Permit. This is a problem in Saratoga that they are dealing with. People just do it they don't ask for permission. As far as she believes the Zoning goes even if he was to have a Bed and Breakfast it is zoned for that with a Special Use Permit. G. Ziehnert asks if he would be able to have a full Bed and Breakfast. T. Yasenchak states that would have to be a different Application. At that point the Board would be asking for additional information than just the Special Use Permit. If he finds it very successful and he decides this is something he wanted to do for a living he is definitely welcome to come back with a different Application and amend that Special Use Permit for a full

B & B. It is an allowable use. G. Ziehnert states that he will start with the air bnb. B. Duffney states that he is not familiar with an air bnb and asks what it is. G. Ziehnert asks if he is familiar with a Bed and Breakfast. B. Duffney states yes. G. Ziehnert states that it is run similarly. There is a company called air bnb that he would work out of. Basically everything is done on line. There are regulations he would follow. Basically someone would come to your home. They book online through the air bnb organization. They usually would stay one or two nights at your home. They have their own bedroom and bathroom. A lot of people go to SPAC for a concert, possibly the track. Even at Skidmore, there are a lot of people that have kids at Skidmore and they don't want to stay in the City of Saratoga where it is so busy. B. Duffney states it is like another member of your family coming to stay with you from out of town. He has no issues with it. K. Conway asks if G. Ziehnert would be present when he has guests there. G. Ziehnert states absolutely because it is his home. K. Conway asks is there a separate entrance. G. Ziehnert states there would be it depends on which bedroom he would use. K. Conway states it would just be, one bedroom. G. Ziehnert states yes just one. S. Weeks asks if there is any requirement that he have a separate bathroom. G. Ziehnert states no you advertise online. For instance, he has a bed with a bathroom in it so I can use that one or another one. Whatever he advertises that is the one he would be using that particular time. S. Weeks states so he would have to advertise it that way. G. Ziehnert states yes. S. Weeks states there have to be some requirements for that. G. Ziehnert states yes, but it's how it is advertised. M. Gyarmathy asks if he is going to try and do weekends at first or how often are you looking to do this. G. Ziehnert states that it depends. Usually people book on the weekends. As summer progresses hopefully people would come on Wednesdays, but mostly Friday and Saturday. M. Gyarmathy states that G. Ziehnert is open to more than just the weekends. G. Ziehnert states yes. C. Dake and J. Bokus are both fine with it. C. Baker states just verification that the septic system is sized for three bedrooms. G. Ziehnert states that the septic system is sized for three bedrooms. G. McKenna states that G. Ziehnert actually has four bedrooms. G. Ziehnert states that he is working on the four bedrooms, but his air bnb will just be one of the bedrooms. C. Baker states that the septic system will have to be designed for four bedrooms. G. McKenna states that he has a septic system issue. G. Ziehnert states that they are definitely going forward with that, but I might not use that bedroom for my air bnb. G. McKenna states that it does not matter. It is a separate thing, but you still need the septic system verification. G. Ziehnert states he thinks that his engineer sent in something. T. Yasenchak states that the Board will need that and that would be part of the approval. As our Town Engineer stated, that is important to know that any home that is requiring a Special Use Permit has a correct septic system. If he can work that out with the Building Department, it is something the Board will need to know. Even if it is part of the project and will be forth coming. C. Baker asks if he has any plans for the new garage to have a garage apartment. G. Ziehnert states no, absolutely not. T. Yasenchak states that because this is a Special Use Permit the Board does have to have a Public Hearing. The Board can schedule a Public Hearing if the Board is in agreement and set it for July 31, 2018. What will happen in between that is the secretary will send out notification to his neighbors within a certain distance that will say he is in front of the Planning Board and asking for a Special Use Permit. They are welcome to come to that meeting and speak. Typically the Board suggests that he go to his neighbors and let them know what he is planning. G. Ziehnert asks if he is coming back on the 31st. T. Yasenchak states yes. In the mean time talk to his engineer so at that next meeting the Board can make a resolution.

M. Gyarmathy rescues himself. David DeMore and Emily Mastrianni are present. T. Yassenchak states this project is for Mann Wireless and it is located at 437 Middle Grove Road, Middle Grove. D. DeMore states that he is with A & D Architect and Design. D. DeMore states Mann Wireless has asked him to represent them through this Application process. They contacted him this winter. They had a conversation about their needs to get some additional storage space and a reworked technical office space. Their business essentially is wireless communication systems. They do a lot of installations and some years ago the owners of the business had secured a Special Use Permit to utilize this property converting it from residential to business. They are here before the Board also for Site Plan Review. D. DeMore states that the project he has before the Board is not a full Application. He is not here to request any action at this time. They are looking at this as a sketch plan meeting. To allow for opportunities to solicit feedback from the Planning Board as they approach the planning of a new project. The owners have been doing their due diligence to figure out if they can find new facilities somewhere in the region in Saratoga, Clifton Park, maybe even Capital District to relocate. So they could have the space they felt they needed. Unfortunately, what they found was a lot of spaces that are open and available for that type of use come with a pretty hefty price tag. One that exceeds their budget for that. Since they have control over the site they want to investigate the opportunity to make the investment on this property. When they started to work their way through it he wasn't prepared to put a full proposal together. He was not sure given the Zoning restrictions on this lot if it was something that could fly. What they did do is to come up with a concept and present the concept to the Board to get their feedback and hopefully that helps them to make a decision on whether or not this could be a viable project. This is sketch plan review that is the purpose of their Application. What they are targeting here is information about potential variances that may be required, or that may already be in effect, that may affect any approvals that have to go forward. To determine if this project is approvable and worth pursuit. Effectively what they have is a pretty tight sight. It's less than an acre in total, .68 acres in total, with an existing house structure on site and an existing garage structure. The intention of the project is to tear down the garage structure and build a new storage garage and technical offices. They have techs that come and go from the site on a regular basis. Sometimes for extended periods. They have to come back to that location to test equipment before they go out for installation. A lot of materials that they utilize involve large reels of cabling and boxes of widgets, things of that nature that have to be taken out put in their vans and taken with them for the installation. As their business has grown the demand for storing that material has grown. As a result they have been relying on a very small component of that existing 450 square foot garage to handle that storage as well as a smaller shed that is further out on the property. What is not shown on the Site Plan is they also have two storage units on the property. They are kind of adapting the site to their needs, but they recognize this is not a long term solution. As well of the fact that they have 12 to 15 people that circulate onto or off of the site. Probably 5-7 of them are daily employees that are on site. The rest come in, check in then they leave for the installation. There is a need to have more defined parking on site and a better structure ingress and egress for the site. As they started to plan it out they looked into the Zoning Ordinance and they have identified it to be in the Town Center District. The minimum lot size in this district is two acres and at .68 acres they are a little shy. He thinks that would possibly be the first variance. They have some pretty hefty setbacks; because this is a corner property they effectively have two front yards. Front yard setbacks requirements in this Zone are 45' and when they lay that out they think the house and garage step over that. He is not sure if that will require a separate variance or if that is encapsulated in the Special Use Permit that was issued previously. He does not have any of those documents from when it was originally issued. They have decided to plan this around the setbacks to see if they can fit what they want to fit on the site. He explains on a map where the proposed addition will go and where deliveries will come in and out of the property. Right now a lot of the trucks that arrive at the site are often relegated

to street parking which is a bit difficult to maneuver around there. As a result sometimes Vehicles Park into a neighboring business parking lot that is across the street. The idea is for this to become a self-sufficient site for the business. If their business were to grow further into the future potentially the building that is there now would be added upward in order to add office space. The idea is for now to build a one story structure, 3100 square feet. 600 square feet would be dedicated to technical staff office use. Leaving 2500 square feet for the storage needs. It would be one story with a low slope roof. No large projecting roof lines. He has not done a full programming exercise to really determine exactly what they need. It may be smaller, but won't be any larger than this. By doing this they are able to rearrange the parking and create 20 parking spaces that they feel confident would handle not only employee parking, but also the occasional guests. It would be defined and those spaces clearly demarcated. It would also give them space to have a clear dumpster location that could be screened. It will allow them to get rid of the shed and the two storage units in the back. All together that is the essence of the project. C. Dake states that being somewhat new he is not terribly familiar with the sketch plan review idea so he does not have any questions at this time. Now that he has heard what is proposed he will look at what has already been approved. T. Yasenchak asks G. McKenna if he knows of any variances having been approved at this property. She knows that there is a Special Use Permit for this property. G. McKenna states that he does have the files out but has not had an opportunity to review them. He believes that they do have a variance. D. DeMore states that the letters that he copied they stipulate that something was approved, but do not stipulate what was approved. G. McKenna states that it was quite a while ago maybe in 2000. E. Mastroeni states that she believes it was for the house, because the company was started in 1998 and thinks in 2000 is when they moved the business from the farm. She believes there was another one a few years later. She thinks Andrea Mann worked on some designs, but didn't go through with it, but, not positive. B. Duffney asks if that Variance went through when the Town changed the Code language when all the small businesses. G. McKenna states, no before then. T. Yasenchak states usually the letters from the Planning Board, because they are specifically referencing a plan they typically are more general, however the variance letters are more specific. D. DeMore states that at this point the preference is to stay in the Town. He thinks that they have found it a very comfortable setting for their business. They are squeezed by the success of the business. Not that they are planning massive growth. The nature of the operation has changed, because of some of the volume that they are dealing with. As a result it is better for their operation to have this additional storage on site. E. Mastrianni states that since a lot of their business has changed because of public safety since 9/11 a lot of schools and buildings are putting in different equipment that was not required before a lot of their storage stuff is larger. They store gigantic batteries that are put into schools to ensure everyone's radios work. The nature of their business is slightly shifting. J. Bokus asks if that district is zoned commercial. D. De More states that it is Town Center which has some benefit in terms of use. The Special Use Permit was granted back in 2000 and back then it was zoned residential. The use would be acceptable in this location now that it is Town Center District and he feels it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan stipulates the desire to concentrate commercial activity in the Town Center Zones. This particular site has a much smaller area than what is indicated for the minimum lot size for this zone. Because of the nature of the comparative scale to size relationship between the structure and the proposed structure he didn't feel comfortable moving forward with a full on push to pull all kinds of stuff together without gaging the sense of the community through the Board to figure out if this is something that would be embraced and moved forward. S. Weeks asks how is the two story house being used. D. DeMore states that currently it is the main office structure; they have offices on the first and second floors. S. Weeks asks G. McKenna if that was approved for. G. McKenna states yes. E. Mastrianni states that they have three branches one in Florida, one in Tennessee and main branch is here. All of their accounting, pay roll, human resources

and corporate are done here in the house. There are 5-6 employees there Monday – Friday. In the garage is a technical bench and storage. The technical bench is where they get their equipment out and test it. They need to do that before they do an install. S. Weeks feels that they do need more space. K. Conway states that they would be removing the existing garage and storage units. E. Mastrianni states yes. K. Conway asks will their hours be the same 9-5. D. DeMore states yes. Some of the techs do arrive back to the office after an install late in the day but that would be a van or a truck coming back. No deliveries coming in after hours. Normal traffic is how he would characterize it. K. Conway asks what is the proposed storage facility going to look like. D. DeMore states that they have not gotten that far. He wanted to gauge the level of interest from the Board. From his perspective he would look to try to minimize the visual impact so it does not over power the main house which now is white and two story with a peak roof. They would try to maintain a more subdued color. Maybe a darker tone color to make it feel smaller. A low slope roof so they don't build height. Also some landscaping. Maybe some trees or Arber vitae. B. Duffney asks if the parking lot would be paved. D. DeMore states paved and striped. B. Duffney asks about the septic system. D. DeMore states that there is an existing septic system on site that is currently serviceable not sure of its size. Truth be told if they go out of this meeting with a general sense that the Planning Board is amenable to the proposal, then the objective would be to get an engineer involved to do the due diligence and understand not only the storm water management but also the septic system. They are really not anticipating any increase in staff. B. Duffney states that they are trying to give themselves more of a working area. One neat little building that takes care of everything. Have there been any problems with the neighbors. E. Mastrianni states not that they are aware of. B. Duffney states that if there was an issue he is sure G. McKenna would be hearing it. He does not see an issue with it. T. Yasenachak states that she agrees with the rest of the Board. She likes to see local businesses continue to grow and stay in our community. The location is a little tight but thinks what they are proposing will be more intentional. When things grow you end up doing what you need to do. This is the next step to making it intentional. Obviously there will be engineering things to think about. Drainage will be a big thing. The Town does have requirements about lot coverage. They will want to try to keep that within those boundaries so they don't need a variance or if they feel that they cannot do that a variance will be required. It seemed like it was over the impervious area. D. DeMore states that what they are proposing as a footprint is maximum and will probably shrink. Then they should be in more compliance with the Town's requirements. The Town's regulations on a loading dock should not be visible and it should be shaded or landscaped, this is a little different. It is something they will be reviewing during their Site Plan Review. If that is something that can't be changed due to maybe losing a parking space or something they could look at. E. Mastrianni states one of thing about the loading dock it would be a whole lot safer for everyone. D. DeMore states that maybe they can architecturally not look like a loading dock. T. Yasenachak states that one thing that they should look into is the Town's requirements for buffers; it is in the Zoning regulations. It may be something you need a variance for. There is a table in the Code that says if they are commercial next to residential. Part of that is landscape buffer and it also is a distance. It's something to look into. It could also be met with a fence, because of the lot size if they are not able to get that buffer. When the employees go out for installations do they drive company vehicles or are they driving their personal vehicles. E. Mastrianni states mostly company vehicles. On occasion they drive their own vehicle. They have five company vehicles. T. Yasenachak states the Town does also have parking regulations. Will there be company and employee vehicles in the parking lot and making sure there might be enough. The Board will also look at that as well as the green space. Over all she thinks the concept is a good idea. It is in Town Center and feels it is good to have a business there. Making it blend and more intentional will be good. Changing the ingress and egress definitely will help the community. Having two separate driveways will help the area. D. DeMore states that it is a little confusing ,

the first time he went there you're not really sure where to go. That is because the property was adapted to this commercial use. What they are looking to do is establish the commercial bonifies of the site by clarifying how to get in and out of the property. They will be working on signage as well. Nothing big just something to indicate where to go. Obviously they have engineering to work through. In terms of process they have indicated the possibility of variances. Should they approach the ZBA first before they come back to the Board? T. Yasechak states just have additional conversation with Code Enforcement to determine what is necessary. C. Baker states this project reminds him that the Board recently on Maple Ave. had in front of them that was trying to put an awful lot on a small lot and feels it is going to be very difficult. When an Application gets to the engineer to work things out, drainage is going to be particularly a problem because they are on two county roads. Typically the county does not allow for drainage discharge into their drains. They are going to have to come up with some creative way to handle it. Septic system is going to be sized for 5-7 people. They are going to have to have verification the septic can handle it. They will have to show location of the well and make sure they have separations there. If they have to replace the system or expand the system make sure they have room to do it. They have buffer requirements like T. Yasechak indicated. It seems like it is very ambitious. D. DeMore states that he will not dispute anything C. Baker is saying. That is something they recognized right from the beginning but also recognize they saw potentially the Board being the first challenge when they are presenting something that offers that much modification to a substandard site. The concern is that it won't garner the support from the people that have to approve it. So they wanted to see if the concept was their and now it is there job to figure out if they can make the concept fly in the way it meets the standards. J. Bokus ask if it is approved as they present it, do they have a projection of how it would satisfy the business needs. E. Mastrianni states that they doubled in size since 2007 with the majority of that work not in New York, it was in the Florida, and Tennessee offices. Their technical team is now 15 employees, the office is 7, and the corporate people are there too. She sees the New York 2-3 more employees within the next 5 years. She sees more business down south. It's too expensive to work in New York City.

Meeting adjourned at 8:08 p.m. All members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberley McMahon
Planning Board Secretary