

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD**  
**PLANNING BOARD**

**January 28, 2020**

**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, Karla Conway, Charlie Dake, Butch Duffney, Robert Roeckle, Nick Querques, Joe Sabanos, alternate. Mike Gyarmathy is absent. Mike Waldron, Code Enforcement Officer, and Charlie Baker, Town Engineer, are present.

**MINUTES**

Minutes- January 14, 2020

January 14, 2020

MOTION: B. Duffney  
SECOND: R. Roeckle

RESOLVED that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of the January 14, 2020 meeting with minor corrections.

**VOTE:** Ayes: Dake, Duffney, Sabaanos, Roeckle, Querques, and Yasenchak  
Noes: None  
Absent: Gyarmathy  
Abstain: Conway

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Provost, C. Case #634**  
**TM# 138.-1-42**

**Grange Road**  
**Minor Subdivision**

Cecil Provost is present. C. Provost states that he is back in front of the Board with a 3<sup>rd</sup> lot that meets C. Baker's site distance. Originally he had a 4 lot subdivision and he reduced it to 3 lots. Now he is back in front of the Board with 4 lots. The lot that C. Baker wanted intersection site distance and the driveway site distance for C. Baker can to see all the way to his office in Clifton Park. C. Baker states that he just wants to clarify for the record, it's not my site distance it's AASHTO requirements. T. Yasenchak states that it is something that the Board has had people do the same standards whether it be a site plan or subdivision. T. Yasenchak asks C. Baker is he has any questions. C. Baker states that he has not seen it yet. K. McMahon explains that it was accidently returned to her at the previous meeting, they did not realize it until late this afternoon. T. Yasenchak states that the Board will need to have C. Baker review this. How does the Board feel about having a public hearing on this project? B. Duffney states the public hearing was for 3 lots and it is now 4 lots. R. Roeckle states that is what he thinks. Is this a new application? C. Provost no it's modified. R. Roeckle states that the Board only approved a 3 lot subdivision, and he is not 100% sure and asks if the Board would have to

rescind the 3 lot subdivision approval and approve a 4 lot subdivision. T. Yasenchak states yes. It is a revision but since the Board already made a determination, the Board has to go through that step to rescind otherwise it would have to be a new application, since the maps were not signed and they were not submitted to the County. C. Provost states that he added the note the Board asked for about the noise. T. Yasenchak states that the Board asked the applicant to put a note on the plans stating that there were businesses in the general vicinity of this property that may have noises associated with them so anyone that was buying any of the properties would know ahead of time. Those businesses were already in operation. R. Roeckle asks because the Board approved the original application does the Board have to vote to amend the application. The Board approved 3 lots. K. Conway asks what happened to the 4 lots. R. Roeckle states that he amended his application during the process. K. Conway asks now he is amending it again. R. Roeckle states yes and it is confusing. C. Baker states that it was approved as a 3 lot subdivision. The Board would have to rescind that decision and start all over again because the Board can't approve another minor subdivision for 5 years. If there is it would be forced to be a major subdivision, if the Board does not rescind the approval. R. Roeckle asks if it would be because it is still only 4 lots. C. Baker states the way the code is written it would become a major subdivision and require long form SEQRA. K. Conway asks because it is 4 lots. C. Baker states correct, because it would then be considered a major subdivision. T. Yasenchak asks M. Waldron to come to the microphone and voice his interpretation. M. Waldron states C. Provost was in before the Board originally for a 4 lot subdivision. K. Conway asks then C. Provost amended the application to a 3 lot subdivision because of the site distances. M. Waldron states correct. K. Conway asks now its back to a 4 lot subdivision. M. Waldron states that it is a 4 lot subdivision now and he had a discussion with C. Provost before the maps were filed. Under minor subdivision (in the Code) if the applicant comes back within 5 years and the applicant tries to subdivide the property it falls under major subdivision. T. Yasenchak states that even if technically the number of lots is less than a "major subdivision". M. Waldron states that doesn't matter. The verbiage was moved from major subdivisions to minor subdivisions, amended in 2011. That specific verbiage calling out any other subdivision within 5 years automatically calls for a major subdivision. That is listed under minor subdivision. R. Roeckle states that technically in order to move forward they would have to rescind the subdivision for 3 lots and have a new resolution for 4 lots or treat this as a major subdivision. M. Waldron states that is as correct as he understands it. T. Yasenchak states that the plans were never finalized. R. Roeckle states that the Board made the motion and approved it. T. Yasenchak states the Board would need to rescind it by a motion before moving forward. B. Duffney asks if the Board needs to have another public hearing. T. Yasenchak states that she would be in favor of having a public hearing only because the last time the Board closed the public hearing it was a 3 lot subdivision. Even though the Board closed with having a 3 lot subdivision it was opened with a 4 lot subdivision. M. Waldron states there has not been a public hearing for a 4 lot subdivision for the property. K. Conway asks if the Board is allowed to rescind the approval. T. Yasenchak states yes. It was never finalized. Technically the Board voted, but it was never signed or filed. C. Provost asks if it was never signed or filed is it still considered approved. T. Yasenchak states yes, it was approved but never finalized. C. Provost asks is there no process amend something once it is approved. T. Yasenchak states that is the process the Board is going through right now is the rescinding of that motion, and having another public hearing. The Board sets a public hearing for February 11, 2020.

C. Dake and B. Duffney recuse themselves. Chuck Marshall and Jim Norton are present. M. Waldron provides the parking and lighting code to the Board. T. Yasenchak states that what M. Waldron provided to the Board is nothing new it is something that is in the Code Book and it can be found online if anyone wanted to look it up. T. Yasenchak states that this is a revision to their approved site plan review. Before the Board opens this up to a public hearing the Board is making sure the applicant has provided enough information for the Board as well as the public to review, make informed decisions and come with informed questions when the Board sets a public hearing. C. Marshall states at the last meeting he introduced additional parking used for a temporary staging area and then permanent parking on the north side of the proposed expansion. It was proposed at the meeting (on January 14, 2020)-the finalized the plan, they provided the SWPPP and resubmitted it on January 17, 2020. The difference in what they are proposing currently from what was previously approved is a 5% to 10% decrease in the overall cut. Primarily because along the northern boundary there is approximately 26' they will not be disturbing. They made the parking compliant with 105-21 (B), particularly section 2, where there are 15 spaces and a landscaped island containing an evergreen tree and 14 spaces. The code prohibits more than 15 spaces in a row. The applicant was asked to show overall compliance with the proposed parking and what the applicant has currently. With the loss of a couple of spaces on the eastern boundary what they are proposing, per code they have 14, 328 square feet of office space which was denoted on the plan. That is one space 300, that is 48 spaces. Per manufacturing code they have one per employee, max shift is 200. The combined code requirement 210 and the combined code requirement are 258. They have 294. They feel they meet the codes requirement, 258, if they factor in things like fleet vehicles and visitors. They have adequate additional parking. By no means do they think they are over parked. They did put the pole lights on the plan down lit LED, on the northern side with the arms extending southern over the roadway. They dropped the elevation of the lights on the building. There was a considerable discussion while traveling north on Locust Grove Road or west on Denton Road that a light was very bright. That light has changed to down lit LED fixtures. C. Marshall asks for a determination from the Board whether the Board is going to use the previously adopted SEQRA and amend it. That was considered an unlisted action. This action would probably be treated the same. There are no lead agencies involved. The Board was granted lead agency status they believe they will be able to make a subsequent SEQRA finding without coordination. That was a lingering question. C. Baker states that he does not, he has started going through the SWPPP report. The dates have been corrected, but has not gotten far. T. Yasenchak states that last time the the Board asked for the applicant to look at the Town's zoning and they did. The applicant does have the green space there because the Town's zoning does limit a continuation of more than 15 spaces. The parking allows for 20% surplus. Because they need 258, with that 20% surplus they are allowed to have around 15 extra. 36 fall within those parameters. That does meet the Town's code. What has happened with the lights on the north side? C. Marshall states that he is not sure if they eliminated the wall packs. J. Sabanos states that it looks like they eliminated them. After reviewing the map C. Marshall states yes, they have been removed. T. Yasenchak states the previous approval had wall packs on the northern side. As part of the discussion they had at the last meeting, the applicant mentioned they would have pole lights in the parking area and in doing that the Board requested that the wall packs perhaps be removed so that there wasn't light shining north. C. Marshall states correct. The original approval was 3 wall packs proposed along the elevation of the building. They have been eliminated for pole lighting. C. Marshall states they changed the abatement for the roof top noise. C. Marshall states yes, previously they had sound blanketing on the outside of them now they are putting them on the inside. They have switched to something that is a little more weather protectant inside the actual condenser. If the Board would like some kind of detail or cut sheet, the applicants can provide that. T. Yasenchak asks if the applicants will still be having something around the condensers as well. C. Marshall states

yes, the fence itself stays. There is no sound blanketing on the fencing. T. Yasenchak asks for a cut sheet on that. She feels that the applicant has provided all the information that was asked for by the Board. The Board wanted to have enough information before the Board sets a public hearing. The Board sets a public hearing for February 11, 2020. C. Marshall states that he will not be able to attend that meeting, but he will be sending Jamie Easton from M.J. Design will be present. He feels that it will be more beneficial so he can answer more of their questions.

---

Meeting adjourned at 7:29 p.m. All members in favor.

---

Respectfully submitted by,

Kimberley McMahon  
Planning Board Secretary

DRAFT