

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD**  
**Planning Board**

**July 13, 2021**

**REGULAR MEETING**

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by Robert Roeckle, Vice Chair, at 7:01 p.m. On roll call the following members are present: Charlie Dake, Robert Roeckle, Joe Sabanos, Mike Gyarmathy and Tonya Yasenchak are present. Karla Conway, Butch Duffney, and Nick Querques are absent. Charlie Baker Town Engineer is present. M. Waldron, Zoning Administrator/Code Enforcement Officer is present. Brian Reichenbach, Town Council is present

---

Minutes

June 29, 2021

Minutes will be reviewed at the next meeting.

---

Peerless Groves, LLC Case #649  
TM# 125.-2-40.1 & 40.12

535 & 540 Locust Grove Road  
Major Subdivision

No one is present for this case. The Board will not discuss this case.

---

Cartier, C. Case #655  
TM# 123.-1-23

355 Plank Road  
SPR/KROD

Cohen Cartier is present. C. Cartier states he is representing Bill and Karen Miller a lot seven, in Sky Ranch off Plank Road. He is here for the Kaydeross Overlay District review. At the last meeting, the Board had requested a couple changes to a sight plan. A couple additional notes including length of clearing the proposed driveway showing an emergency turn around the 20 foot wide allowing the main driveway. There's a note with the signage that was included from the original sight plan. T. Yasenchak asks are those actual pull offs? C. Cartier states that's what was approved previously. T. Yasenchack states they didn't actually show. She asks about the driveway road at Plank Road has any of that changed as far as the location of the driveway or on the original approved plan or gate, originally intended for that driveway. C. Cartier states that he believes it is the original driveway that Mr. Evans, installed. T. Yasenchak asks if the gates were already up. She asks M. Waldron, the Code Enforcement Official about that and she also asks the Board. She states that she doesn't recall any gates being there because it could cause people to back up on Plank Road or stay on Plank Road. She just want to make sure that because this is a shared driveway that isn't only for the applicant, and there's other lots that use this driveway, even if it was put in by Mr. Evans, who continues to own the

rest of the property that it was done according to the sight plan. To make sure everything is clear going forward for future owners, including a possible gate make sure that it was done according to the original sight plan I'm not saying it's going to hold anything up, but possibly it could be a contingency to just look at it. She asks M. Waldron if he has any knowledge of this. M. Waldron states he does not, but he can surely look into it. M. Waldron states he was up there a few weeks ago and he knows that the gates are there, but it is not locked. As far as Site Plan Approval he will have to go back and look into that. T. Yasenchak states there have been a lot of changes on this particular subdivision. There was a lot going back and forth and to make sure that everyone safeguarded going forward for future owners. She asks C. Baker if he remembers anything about the gates. C. Baker states that he did do an inspection up there and he does not remember any gates there at that time. T. Yasenchak states the Board does have the driving notes on the plan about the weight of the vehicle. She asks if any of the Board members if they have any questions about the second submitted. The Board states no. T. Yasenchak asks the Board how they feel about a contingent approval of the Site Plan Review based on the building department double checking about the date and the Board having something in writing about that. This is just for the up the rest of the public. This is a shared drive way that has I think three or four lots that are sharing the same, at least 3123. And maybe four, number nine might be two. So at least three, maybe four lots are sharing the same driveway. And we want to make sure that nobody has limited access to their property, because of just because someone is the first to build on it. And so also, this is instance, this is a Site Plan, review and key read over overlay district, we don't have to do a public hearing on it. There are many public hearings that were done on this, at the time was an approved subdivision, we're just looking at the size of the type of building, which we reviewed to be consistent within our KROD Overlay District regulations. T. Yasenchak states if the Board feels, that if they waived the public hearing she thinks we actually need it. The Board will make note the public hearing has been waived. With the condition that the gates be reviewed by the Building Department to be compliant and consistent with the approved subdivision that is on record prior because we can't put any condition prior to building Permit. The Board can just say that it is conditioned upon review, interpretation by the building department. R. Roeckle states and we should also make a note that those notes weren't on the original drawing, we would like it removed. T. Yasenchak states yes. M. Gyarmathy feels that it should be a condition of the approval if not the subdivision should be reviewed. T. Yasenchak states what M. Gyarmathy said is that also the condition being that if they were not on the original approved subdivision plan that the gates be removed. How does the board feel about that? She just feels as far a safety concern on a driveway that shared by at least four lots.

MOTION: R. Roeckle  
SECOND: C. Dake

RESOLVED, that the Town of Greenfield Planning, hereby grants approval for 355 Plank Road, TM# 123.-1-23, for Site Plan Review in the KROD Overlay District for a Single Family Residence made the following Resolution:

- the building department review the original approved subdivision plans and whether the gates were there

VOTE: Ayes: C. Dake, M. Gyarmathy, Robert Roeckle, J. Sabanos, and T. Yasenchak  
Noes: None  
Abstain: M. Gyarmathy and N. Querques  
Absent: Karla Conway, and Butch Duffney

T. Yasenachak this used in submitted an application for a Lot Line Adjustment on Grange Road and this did come into the Building Department. This is a little bit of a gray area the applicant has an approved four lot subdivisions that was approved subdivision that the Board reviewed not too long ago the applicant purchased a landlocked parcel next to it and is requesting a lot line adjustments to all the parcels so that they all have correct frontage. The Building Department asked the Board to review it and have a discussion of whether we feel this is a Lot Line Adjustments involving or does this fall into a major subdivision. C. Provost states that he bought the lot behind where he did the subdivision and wants and he wants to do a Lot Line Adjustment with the property. T. Yasenachak asks if any of those driveways change. The Board can see a proposed driveway; she asks if the already approved subdivision driveways are still where they were approved? C. Provost states that there are no changes he had a site engineer go out to make sure. T. Yasenachak states the information that you gave the Board doesn't show where the fourth driveway and was there a driveway that was proposed on the approved original? C. Provost he does not have the original approved maps they are on file. She would like to see what the sight distance and to be able to compare this lot. C. Provost has a proposed driveway and those were done according to driveway sight stopping site distance, intersection, site distance. She asks is there a reason that the originally was that fourth lot is not square in shape? She asks the Board to voice your thoughts of whether they feel this is a subdivision or whether this is a lot line adjustment. The Board does have what's a little odd but do have they had five lots that were approved. One was done because it was already, existing lot that had no frontage and now that does have frontage. R. Roeckle states there were originally guidelines for lot subdivision and the one loss. Just wondering why. Because this is a boundary line adjustment, and it is referencing a previous subdivision that may be why all of the driveway information for each of the five driveways is not on this map. He asks if that is the one land locked for the driveway. C. Provost states that there is a table on the map. C. Baker states that he does not believe there is. T. Yasenachak agrees. R. Roeckle states that it is still 5 lots. N. Querques states he doesn't have much to say about it. It seems like its part of the subdivision in the minor subdivision we've already done, but I don't have any questions right now. J. Sabanos states that he does not have any concerns at this time. He states he don't really see any major concerns to the applicant. T. Yasenachak asks if this map has been filed. C. Provost states yes, it was. T. Yasenachak states it was filed at the county. So that these have their own tax map parcels? C. Provost states yes, it is provided to the county provided. T. Yasenachak states she just wanted to verify that for the record. M Gyarmathy states that he agrees with J. Sabanos. C. Dake states he thinks he's less confident than M. Gyarmathy and J. Sabanos are but I think I'm reaching the same conclusion it looks. He doesn't see any reason why isn't a lot line adjustment. K. Conway state's it's an interpretation thing, so I don't have anything else. She agrees with M. Gyarmathy and J. Sabanons. She thinks it's a Lot Line Adjustment. C. Baker refers the Board and states the Board did make a note on the plan. He asks one of the Board members to read note. K. Conway reads note number 3 on the map stating any further subdivision of land, by the standards of Article two with provisions within five years from the date of approval will be considered a Major Subdivision. C. Baker states if you remember, one of the reasons was if it was to go over an acre less than five acres for disturbance area. That is one of the reasons it was so important to look at it. T. Yasenachak states what if not all of the lots changed? And there was just one Lot Line Adjustment between the one the furthest, to the south,

landlocked parcel? C. Baker states he is having a trouble understanding what is the Land Line? T. Yasenchak explains the one on the other side of that stone wall that was a landlocked parcel. What the Applicant is requesting is taking what would be the furthest southern lot, which, that was lot 1 and making a Lot Line Adjustment to give the bulk of that to the currently lot. C. Provost states this is a 5 lot subdivision. C. Provost states that the driveways are not changing. T. Yasenchak states going forward she thinks that the Board needs more information to be able to adequately compare apples to apples. The Board will need to see something that shows the layout of the map and how it is now. The Board will want to see the additional driveway, and all of the driveway locations to be shown with the site distance mapped out, she thinks perhaps a second map that shows an overlay of what exists and what is proposed will help so that way, it's easier to compare. Like what our town engineer is saying, is that right now, the Board is kind of eyeballing it. C. Provost states this is the one that was previously approved and this is what he is proposing. Basically the lot gets a lot bigger. T. Yasenchak states that typically what is shown on the plan is what is existing and then show what is proposed and show the location of the driveways and the site distance as well as an overlay so that the Board can see how everything is shifting. She states that she is not comfortable with the odd shape of the lot. She states that she would like to see the lot square. She is not comfortable when lots come to a point. That's the Board's question what parcels there are, and the applicant didn't use his original subdivision. She is requesting a mylar map so the Board could review the changes. M. Gyarmathy states originally this was a 4 lot subdivision and the applicant bought a land locked parcel now it is a five lots subdivision. T. Yasenchak states he has a four lot subdivision that is on file with Saratoga County as a legal subdivision. There is another lot additional to the side that had no frontage. C. Provost wants to do a Lot Line Adjustment. She asks if the same and have changed and if all you were doing was giving some more land to one lot would be legal. She states she feels more comfortable with that because she thinks that's more of the intent making this lot difference, but making changes to all of the lots. She states that she does agree with C. Baker the Town Engineer said, the Board did reviewed storm water and driveways for all of those other lots. C. Provost states that he will have to file all the DEC because he is disturbing 5 acres not like originally approved 1 acre disturbance. He states that he can leave lots 2, 3, and 4 if that's really an issue would. N. Querques states that he feels more comfortable with that because the applicant is now changing the subdivision that the Board spent a lot of time working with the applicant on to get to where they all comfortable with. C. Dake agrees with N. Querques, but the Board spent a lot of time on the original division. R. Roeckle states that he does not have any issues with it if they can see an overlay. He asks if this would require another public hearing. B. Reichenbach states not if the lots are not changing and the applicant is just adding more land to one lot then no it is considered a Lot Line Adjustment. C. Provost states that lots 2, 3, and 4 don't have to change. J. Sabanos asks if the Board feels they have enough information to approve this application. T. Yasenchak states she doesn't feel they do because the lines have changed. She states that is where she got confused when the applicant started moving the lines around. we can see a true comparison of what was approved and what is now being proposed, but feels that the Board needs to make an informed decision. She thinks this needs an assessment if the map was clearer, she would be, comfortable with that. R. Roeckle asks if the lots change do they need to have a public hearing. B. Reichenbach states if it isn't making a changes to an existing subdivision, which had a public hearing on a lot then no. If the lots as they were currently approved have now changing, would require a public hearing. T. Yasenchak states in our regulations for minor subdivisions, we don't have to have the public hearing, it's something that we can waive, however, with that, we typically always err on caution

and have public hearings. She think that it is something that the Board could discuss if when they get to that point of looking at a final map, we couldn't have any public hearings, it doesn't change the lots, as it was originally approved it is a simple outline adjustment. There would be no action required by the Board. In the past simple lot line adjustments have been done internally administratively. T. Yasenchak states when they get complicated in more than one or two lines, we tend to bring them in front of the Board. C. Provost states that he can do what the Board wants him to provide a color coded map or something to make it clearer. J. Sababnos asks if the Board has a map that we could actually make that determination on. T. Yasenchak states no, and she thinks that he's heard the Board's thoughts about it and how they feel, it is really up to C. Provost on how he would want to proceed and what he would want to bring before the Board. K. Conway states she doesn't have a problem with it and she is thinking this could go either way for her, but if it does change with the lots she agrees with J. Sabanos and R. Roeckle the Board should have a public hearing. T. Yasenchak states if the applicant was just adding the lot to the southern lot, then she wouldn't have a problem. that's fine. T. Yasenchak states it is inconsistent. It's just not a standard lot. She knows that the elevation when looking at this, it does go downhill. But it reduces setbacks as you go further back, so it ends up with less usable space. Typical planning is consistently geometrical. She would like to see something that's more consistent, that is easier for people to use and look at their boundary lines. She also feels that if the three lines were the same, rather than what the Board is looking at changing there are so many different lot lines, it just seems a little bit convoluted. She feels having something that the Board can compare like an overlay, comparing specific driveways and all that that would be important.

---

Maletesta, S. & L. Case #651  
TM# 124.-1-14

41 Plank Road  
Minor Subdivision

T. Yasenchak states this is a minor subdivision. It's one larger lot being subdivided into two. L. Maletesta states they are requesting lot 1 is 10.39 acres and lot 2 is 25.13 acres. T. Yasenchak states all neighbors were notified; they received a letter saying that they are before the Board for a public hearing. She opens the public hearing at 7:42 p.m. There is no one present to speak about this project and no correspondence. The Board closes public hearing at 7:43. She asks C. Baker, if he has any other comments. C. Baker states only the standard notes to be added to subdivision map.

MOTION: C. Dake  
SECOND: R. Roeckle

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered "no" and the second box is checked, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impacts for the Minor Subdivision of Sean and Lisa Maletesta for property to be located at 41 Plank Road, TM# 124.-1-14.

VOTES: K. Conway, C. Dake, M. Gyarmathy, R. Roeckle, J. Sabanos, T. Yasenchak, and N. Querques

Noes: None  
Abstain: None

Absent: B. Duffney

MOTION: N. Querques

SECOND: M. Gyarmathy

RESOLVED, that the Town of Greenfield Planning Board, hereby grants approval for a Minor Subdivision of Sean and Lisa Maletesta for property to be located at 41 Plank Road, TM# 124.-1-14 contingent upon:

- having the standard subdivision notes added to the maps

VOTES: K. Conway, C. Dake, M. Gyarmathy, R. Roeckle, J. Sabanos, T. Yasenchak, and N. Querques

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: B. Duffney

---

Roeckel, R. Case #652  
TM# 15.-1-46

445 North Creek Road  
SUP

Robert Roeckle is present. T. Yasenchak states he is in front of the Board for a Special Use Permit and because this is a Special Use Permit, the Board is required to have a public hearing. And this project has had a public hearing before in front of the Zoning Board of Appeals for which he received his Variance. Because we require it during our process, we will be having another one. She doesn't believe that at the last meeting the Board asked R. Roeckle for any additional information. R. Roeckle state that he wants to build a two car garage apartment on his property at his home at 445 North Creek Road, and he was granted a Variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals for an apartment larger than the 40% allowed. He states that he has a very small house. T. Yasenchak states the Board opens a public hearing at 7:55 p.m. The Board closes the public hearing at 7:56. She states that she doesn't believe the Board does not need to we doesn't on this. She asks C. Baker if that is correct? C. Baker states no. The Board can go forward with a motion.

MOTION: J. Sabanos

SECOND: C. Dake

RESOLVED, that the Town of Greenfield Planning Board, hereby grants approval for Robert Roeckle, for property located at 445 North Creek Road, TM# 151.-1-46 for a Special Use Permit.

VOTES: K. Conway, C. Dake, M. Gyarmathy, R. Roeckle, J. Sabanos, T. Yasenchak, and N. Querques

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: B. Duffney

---

Menter, D. Case #653  
TM# 152.-33.2 & 93

41/41A Locust Grove Road  
SUP/SPR

David Menter and John Lapper are present. T. Yasenchak states that this is in front of the Board for a Special Use Permit and Site Plan Review. This is for operation of a Bed and Breakfast, they already have a Special Use Permit that has been previously approved Site Plan. However, because it is changing owners, the Board needs to review that again. T. Yasenchak states the Board did ask for some additional information. The applicant did confirm the adequacy of the septic system for the continued use. Charlie, would you like to believe that recommendation C. Baker states that he did receive the report and it is satisfactory to him. D. Menter states that the material for the handicapped ramp will be wood and the first page is the location, of the ramp and essentially it shows the ramp location along the house. And then the rest of it is a wooden walkway. The second page shows the elevation aspects of it. There's a 17 inch elevation there, the ramp itself is 17 feet long. And then the third page is just pictures of the location. R. Roeckle states that the Board received a letter from the adjacent property owners stating that he has an easement through the applicant's property. J. Sabanos states that there is a picture on the bottom left actually is a representation of what would be constructed. J. Lapper states that Allison Menter, (the applicant's daughter) is a licensed massage therapist and will be providing massage services to the public. She will be using one of the 8 rooms as the message room. J. Lapper states that the Menter's own several commercial properties in Lake George. T. Yasenchak opens the public hearing at 8:02 p.m. here is no one present to speak regarding this case and there is that only one correspondence. The Board closes the public hearing at 8:04 p.m.

MOTION: M. Gyarmathy  
SECOND: N. Querques

RESOLVED, that the Town of Greenfield Planning Board, hereby grants approval for David Menter, for property located at 41/41A Locust Grove Road, TM# 152.-1-33.2 & 96 for a Special Use Permit and Site Plan Review.

VOTES: K. Conway, C. Dake, M. Gyarmathy, R. Roeckle, J. Sabanos, T. Yasenchak, and N. Querques  
Noes: None  
Abstain: None  
Absent: B. Duffney

## **DISCUSSION**

T. Yasenchak states that at the last meeting the Board did have discussion at the last meeting that if , the Board received the additional information within 10 days of the next meeting information But we could just say we received the information and set the public hearing. So they didn't have to wait the extra two weeks to set the public hearing to just come back in two weeks. The applicant has submitted

the information. It hasn't been reviewed yet. She asks how the board feels about setting that public hearing for our next meeting, which would be July 27. The Board sets a public hearing for a Minor Subdivision on King Road.

---

US Light Energy Case #648  
TM# 163.-2-90 & 91

370 Middle Grove Road  
SUP/SPR

T, Yassenchak states this project is 370 Middle Grove Road and it is in front of the Board for Special Use Permit and Site Plan Review for a Solar Energy. Chris Koenig, Zach Lissard, and Mike Fingar are present. C. Koenig states that his company C. T. Male is working with US Light Energy and they are proposing Community Solar Farm and they are here to follow up on some items that were requested and the last meeting. The submission included updated Site Plans to address Mr. Baker's (the Town Engineer) and he provided the SWPPP with the elevation profiles as requested, visual renderings which they have tried to record as 11.5' x 17' printouts. They have projections for the public to see as well some of the renderings. We have FAA notification and we recently received a no impact to air navigation from the FAA, which they can discuss later. They were all those were submitted on June 17 2021. In addition to the submission, they also have provided to the board and to the Town's designated engineer, Mr. Baker, responses to his comments, which were 16 comments, and they responded to all those, responses are incorporated in the cover letter. In terms of the Site Plan, he thinks the orientation of the theory has stayed the same. They walked the site with the Board. The changes largely include an increase to the screening, and vegetative screening on the site. Another update is the panel height, external panel height, was originally proposed 12' tall at its highest point, and now its 8' tall. The chain link fence itself at perimeter increased with, screening on it to further mitigate the review. That would be prime competitive screening. It's really just a response to the public comments, they heard at the last meeting to further screen this project with Middle Grove Road from the adjoining residences. They increased the width of the road entrance to 20' wide, the first turn around; there is a little more room at that location. Then the road then tapers down 12', which is they need for access for construction and for operation and maintenance of the system. T. Yassenchak asks if the erosion and sediment control plan, the SWPPP, is under acreage under an acre. Z. Lissard states that the industry data suggests that they provide an erosion and sediment control slip from their Pollution Prevention Plan, which basically outlines what they are proposing on the site to mitigate sedimentation and erosion, construction. It's really just kind of a narrative of what's on the Site Plan and what hasn't been submitted the site elevation profiles. The driveway turnarounds are big enough for the Fire Company and it comes up to the connection point and the system main cut off. If there is any emergency there, fire trucks pull in and access that emergency kill switch. It powers the whole facility, in addition to stabilize area 20' and also allows National Grid to get in and service their poles, which they can at any time, without, with enough space and safety. Where they are going now is based on previous comments from the Board members. All the trees in the solar array, that is referenced and is to scale. T. Yassenchak states she thinks that it's important to go through each of those questions in detail. Even though the applicant's responses are on the record, the Board would like it to Board can discuss or have anything you have any other questions. T. Yassenchak states



1. One electronic copy should be provided.
2. the plans indicate minimum 100' setback as indicated in the Code.
3. Are they just acknowledging that it is a 100' setback?

Z. Lissard states yes, we confirm. The plan provides a detail showing the panel height ranging from a minimum 3' to a maximum 12' above the ground. The proposed detail indicates that the panel height will not exceed the 15' maximum tall. They went back and worked on their engineering and they were able to lower the panels like C. Koenig said they're able to lower the maximum height of the panels down to approximately 8.5'. It's actually a little less than above ground elevation. T. Yasenchak asks if that is about the downgrade above ground elevations. C. Koenig states it on a slope, that 8' is that measured from the downgrade or at what point of the panel is the front or the back of the demonstration. She asks what portion that would be the highest portion to the lowest point. Z. Lissard states the applicants provide a total area within the chain link fence of 18.34 acres. The allowable maximum lock coverage is 18.34 acres 15% of 122.3 acre combined parcel.

4. There appears to be an additional point 1.5, plus or minus acres of development area access road and turn around located outside of the fence parcel. Should this additional area be included in the maximum lot coverage? The total amount of site to service should be shown on the plans. And our response was the area bounded by the fencing area, the access road outside of the fencing. The combined footprint of the utility poles is 18.34 acres, or 14.99% of the combined parcel of total, which is 122.32 acres, as indicated on sheet 102 of the Site Plan, attachment 1, area of disturbance .15 plus an additional two acres has been added to the access road on page 102 of the Site Plans located outside the fence. T. Yasenchak asks if he is that he counted the space that was within. Z. Lissard states the space within the fence line and the areas of the utility poles, and the fencing and the accessory. T. Yasenchak asks if they have included the all the access road going, even if it's outside of the fencing, you've included? In the end, they made it wider. Did you modify that number within the fence? Z. Lissard states there's a turnaround at the end, just shortened it up. So we can make our requirements. We won't affect anything. It should be around one extension or turnaround. M. Waldron asks if the revised plan less than 15% of coverage including the driveway. Z. Lissard states yes. T. Yasenchak asks if that is why they shorten it. Z. Lissard states that they made the necessary adjustments to maintain that requirement. T. Yasenchak states it does it include any of the box or the connections and anything else outside of that fencing. She asks what else is happening with the connection. C. Koenig states it is such a small area really has little effect on the surface area. T. Yasenchak states one would say but they also add up. Z. Lissard states they included with the construction that is correct with the additional width for the fire trucks for the grid in the access. In order to maintain their requirements. They shortened one. T. Yasenchak asks do you where is your connection. Usually there's a housing and connection later connection and that's all included. Z. Lissard states they actually added more at the request of the Board, there is an interconnection device. Just to clarify here, everything that's associated with this project, including the access roads from Middle Grove Road is included. Z. Lissard states they are rack mounted, so there is no additional footprint within the fenced area. They actually enclosed the entire array that's included in the coverage plus the access road plus in diameter. T. Yasenchak states everything inside the fencing was counted. She states that she wants to clarify that. Z. Lissard states they were counted. T. Yasenchak asks how many poles are there and how far apart are they and what kind of wires are hanging off of those, at what height. Z. Lissard states that

they are the exact same height than you'd normally see driving down the road, they are 13.2' in distribution voltage around this area, and it's also the area that serves as property. And that will be connected to the equipment's been included in their renderings as well. He is not sure if that's helpful for anybody, but it's very similar to see to be receiving and traveling down the road, same kind of thing. They're shown on the packet if the Board members have it. T. Yassenchak states that she likes to have everything verbalized. So that people who are here who don't have the privilege of having all the documentation in front of them can understand where the Board is coming from. C. Baker asks about the overall disturbance? He asks will they be grubbing or removing topsoil or, vegetation. Z. Lissard states as long as you have vegetation in place, vegetation filters out. He states they are not removing anything. They're just placing fabric on top, and then they will put stone and then when they are done, they will remove the stone and the fabric. There's no alteration to the ground compaction or anything, it's just going to remain the same. C. Baker asks what about the area of the vegetative buffers planting trees that included 3.94 acres.

5. Z. Lissard states it is an increase from our original proposal was point seven 2.3 in accordance with the international fire code, it should have a minimum width of 20' not including the shoulder. The proposed 12' wide access road would not appear adequate for both the initial construction entrance northern permanent emergency access. Access road should be reviewed by the local fire code official and the fire department. The fire department should determine if a permanent road is required and provide comments related to any other provisions for the fire apparatus access. The access road will be maintained, plowed in the winter. Is this acceptable to the fire department. The total area of access road coverage should be provided on the plan and accounted for the storm water pollution prevention plan. That they talked about the expansion of the road for the Fire Code they have submitted plans copied and a set of these comments to the Fire District probably think we can get their comments back maybe by the end of this week. And then in our written response to the Board. According to Section 503.112 of the New York State Fire Code which incorporates the international fire code access roads for soldiers who may be exempted from the requirements of Section 503 of the fire code." Were approved by the Fire Code Official fire apparatus access roads shall be Permitted to be exempted or modified for photo". Photo related power generation facilities close quote. They agree that the Site Plan should be coordinated through the Fire Code Official counterparts in the code. Code Enforcement Officer in the Greenfield Fire District to determine the appropriate width of access rule given the size of the largest fire apparatus that is likely to respond to an emergency at the facility. It is noted that the driveway entrance into the site has been increased to 20' wide to allow for access by National Grid bucket trucks. And then the road tapers down to 12' within the site, which is an optimal with practice during construction and operation of the facility. The use of the constructed turnarounds alleviates the need for a wider access road, as shown on attachment 1 Site Plans. The access road will be plowed as needed to maintain access to the main system disconnect control loaded, located at a distance interconnection adjacent to Middle Grove Road. Coordination with the Greenfield Fire District will determine if that is adequate. The site filing will be .46 acres is provided on sheet C 102 on the Site Plan and is accounted for and erosion and sediment control design, as well as the erosion and sediment control plan which is included as attachment 2.

6. The Fire Code Official should review the Town of Greenfields Emergency Response Plan. They have ever provided them with the comments and the Site Plans for his review.

7. The applicant should provide additional details for the point of connection. The plan should show proposed access driveway for all locations and any other equipment that may be required at the interconnection location. The detailed plan should provide a total area of service at the interconnection location and provide a detailed grading and drainage plan equal to 1' and 1" equals 30' scale or greater. The plan should include a visual assessment to determine if vegetative screening is required. The applicant should provide documentation that the project has been reviewed by the New York Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation, the SHPO to talk about that, more than read the written one. They have added that and he added the point that details of the interconnection are there the Board can see it in the top right corner. That's shown on the actual interconnection layout detail. It's an inset on sheet 104 you see right there on Site Plans and the area of the service within the inset area includes that area of access roads, the vegetative screen planning and the diameter of the 6 utility poles which are typically installed using an auger no grading is proposed in the area of drainage will consist of infiltration through the pervious surfaces, including the pervious gravel access road. A visual assessment has been included in this submission, which includes elevation profiles, which he showed earlier, and photo renderings of the project which he will show here in a second. Significant vegetative screening is proposed and is shown and specified on the Site Plan. The New York SHPO has issued no effect binding letter for the project. This letter was issued on June 9, 2020 and is attached to Part 1 full Environmental Assessment form the AF included in the March 15, 2021 submission to the Greenfield Planning Board. Z. Lissard reviews an overhead of the renderings. A resident asks can we comment on the rendering. T. Yasenchak states no, this isn't they have not reopen the public hearing yet. Z. Lissard states the tree species they spoken of white spruce, red cedar and the blue spruce. Blue spruce would only be in a small area. T. Yasenchak asks what they are proposing for the plant height at this installation. Z. Lissard states the blue spruces be 5'-6'. C. Koenig states 6'-8'. Z. Lissard states they will be staggered resistance interconnect here and then we're looking at you know, sir, that's our artist's rendering. That's just a graph. That's just a dirt road that exists over there. That is their insurance on the Site Plan. R. Roeckle asks the trees that they are prosing what year is showing. Z. Lissard states the bigger trees are the more mature trees.

8. The information that was provides verification and documentation that the project will not create any problems associated with both heat and glare. The applicant should also provide documentation that the FAA was notified of the project. Actually, we had received confirmation from FAA last week. FAA issued a negative determination of no hazard. T. Yasenchak states because the Board received this tonight, the Board will not be reviewing it but put it in the file for the public and give a copy of it to everybody on the Board as well as Town Council, our Town Engineer and the Town Code Enforcement Official. Z. Lissard states that regarding solar panels are designed to operate at safe temperatures and not adversely affect the surrounding area. The installation of solar panels is unlike cooling air space between the ground and the panels, which reduces the heat effect by not raising the ambient temperature from the above the ground surface. Regarding glare, an updated glare analysis was submitted to the Greenfield Planning Board on April 20, 2021. T. Yasenchak asks if Z. Lissard could repeat that. She asks if he is saying that there's a space between the bottom of the panel and the ground. Z. Lissard, states yes. T. Yasenchak asks what is that distance of the lowest area going to be. Z. Lissard states the lowest area will be about 3'. T. Yasenchak states that any water that would be heated would be cooled. Z. Lissard states it's more like the island effect, as the asphalt, heats up, it radiates and you have this circular convective heat. Whereas if you have ground soil itself, it was always heat but there's also airflow. T. Yasenchak asks if he is saying there'll be airflow underneath the bottom of the panels. Z. Lissard states correct. Regarding glare, an updated glare analysis was submitted to the Greenfield Planning Board on April 20, 2021. The glare analysis was performed in accordance with the FAA standards and guidelines. The glare analysis concluded that no

impact aviation or the public due to glare or anticipated In addition, the panels will be a fixed position facing south away from the homes on the Middle Grove Road the panels are designed to absorb solar. Regarding FAA notification the applicant has requested a routine obstruction evaluation aeronautical statement. This is the request this request is currently in progress with FAA. Evidence of this request was included in attachment A and what they just provided the Board with the final determination.

9. The applicants should submit a coordinated electric service interconnection review, verifying the project feasibility this information does not appear to be included with the documents submitted. The applicant should provide a written confirmation from National Grid that the electric grid has a capacity to support the energy to be generated. Their response from National Grid is performed a Caesar study for the proposed project and determined that the project is feasible a copy of the Caesar study is included as attachment 6. Coming in the applicant was as the applicant has indicated that the total size of disturbance was less than one acre and Storm water Pollution Prevention Plan also known as the SWPPP has not been provided for the project. The total amount of site service should be shown on the detailed Site Plan. The area of the site service should include all portions to the Permit site access road included both inside and outside the fenced areas. The site the service areas should also include the temporary laydown area to be used during construction. They suggest that a basics with the Prepare for the project. He states that C. Koenig touched on this earlier their response the area of the service plus or minus .92 acre has been added to sheet C 102 of the Site Plans has been a total ground of services less than 1 acre. Therefore State Pollution Discharge Elimination System SPDES Permit coverage and a SWPPP are not required by the State. An erosion sediment control plan will be constructed and maintained on the site are included in the Site Plan sheet 1, C 103, 104 and 502. At the request of EDP (Environment Design Partners) they have prepared an ESD plan which is included as attachment to this submission. We touched on that earlier in question 1.

12. The ambient noise level at its highest would be 27 decibels. The average ambient decibel for a solar site is about 40 decibels. This should identify any noise producing equipment and submit details are going to noise generated by each piece of equipment as a facility as a whole. In summary, the noise producing electrical equipment proposed that the site inverters and transformers specifically, would only operate during late daylight hours and would generate low foaming noise that is less than me a daylight noise level the local area. The inverters and transformers are located over 200' from the closest residence. And the vegetative screening that is proposed will also provide a noise brought her a significant increase in the correct local ambient noise is not because of the project. They have also provided a noise study that demonstrates he thinks it's in your packet and he thinks the ambient of noise would be around the highest one would be at 27 decibels and the average ambient decibel level for rural site rural, areas is around 40 decibels.

13. The project documents include New York Community Solar Facility decommissioning plan and agreement facility. The decommissioning plan includes information related to a removal bond for the both the plant and the removal bond require review by the Town Attorney and approval of the Town Board. They suggest that this document be presented to the Town Board for review and approval. Their response we acknowledge the comment, an updated decommissioning plan is included as attachment 8 of this submission.

14. The decommissioning plan includes an estimated cost of decommissioning \$118,634.00 based on their experience with similar projects, and review of the NYSERDA decommissioning solar panel systems document. estimated costs appears when they look they're nicer to document get an estimated cost in today's dollars, approximately \$30,100 per megawatt, alternating current applying an estimated 2.5% inflation rate over 20 years would increase the megawatt cost approximately \$49,450. Using a NYSERDA guide and its estimated costs would be approximately \$185,438. 00. The applicant

should read about re-evaluate the decommissioning cost an estimated bond amount enough in an article response to an updated decommissioning plan is included as attachment as attached in this submission. T. Yasenchak asks Could you speak to that there was an aside just for the record? Can you tell the Board what is being changed record and for the sake of the audience. Z. Lissard states They re-evaluated the cost below our current estimated costs to decommission at 3.75 megawatt 5.2 megawatt solar facility based on guidance from NYSERDA and estimates from Massachusetts market and mature solar market with experienced decommissioning project. salvage value is a valuable recyclable material, i.e. aluminum, steel, copper etc., are not factored into the cost of the load. The scrap value is determined on the current market rate at time salvage. Their finance department estimated that after a total of 25 years, it would cost approximately \$169,161.15 to decommission the project after 25 years. That is an increase from the original plan. J. Sabanos asks is there lots of reasons for an increase in this for 35 years. Is that correct? M. Fingar states to do any analysis based on a 35 years, it is an options. They would have to negotiate that. They would have to revisit that one. So I would propose that if we were to extend that we actually ended up now having to re-evaluate what their options are. That's their position. J. Sabanos states the he feels it should be done and he would like Tow Council to review it. They didn't expect it. Z. Lissard states according to pursuant to Article 8 of the New York State Labor Code, prevailing wages require public work projects and at the past 3 prong test. Basically, first is public agency must be a party to a contract involving employment of labor, workman, or mechanic. Second, the contract must concern a project that primarily involves construction like labor and is paid for by public funds. In the third, the primary objective, or function of the work product must be you must be the use or the benefit of general for the general public. Their response would be the decommissioning of a private solar project is not a public works project because it is not paid for with public funds. Such funds are private to the extent they are posted by the solar developer. Additionally, the decommissioning is not for the use of benefit to the public. Once the project is decommissioned, it will be returned to the landowner and such accordingly, decommissioning activities are not public work projects. J. Sabanos states that he definitely would like the Town's Legal Counsel's, interpretation of that. T. Yasenchak states the Board will have Town Council review it and ask for an interpretation of it. She states that if the Town had to remove it the Town would be paying their staff a prevailing wage. At that point, the Town would be paying prevailing wage, or paying their staff to do it, which may be different than hiring a private company to do so. Yeah, that's, that's the way my paygrade so that's that's where you're going with that. Z. Lissard states that is their thinking as well.

15. The fiscal and economic analysis document should be reviewed and approved by the Town Board. They agree, they accepted comments that were in the response.

16. the last one had a memorandum of lease and solar easement. And the New York State Standard Site Control Certification form should be reviewed by the Town Attorney. They agree, and they are willing to work through that. That is in the comments.

R. Roeckle asks which one on page C 102 is going to be encroaching 100' setback. C. Koenig states where the fence lines line is. R. Roeckle states having that image more representation on the Site Plan showing boundaries for satellite image. He states that he would like something more accurate and more clarified. N. Querques states would see different visuals to include the chain link fence and right now it looks like it's just the panels that you're showing the vegetation, the panel,

that chain link fence is going to be. M. Fingar states correct. But he also just wants to point out that they will be adding screening which is a fabric over the front of the fence. What you're seeing is actually a fabric. N. Querques asks how tall the fence is. Z. Lissard states 8' tall chain link fence. of the two panel setup in the background was like it's just I didn't know if it was shaded or not. So we'll be in shape. But what you're seeing there at the front, after the trees is actually the front of the fence, which is covered in darkness. J. Sabanos states at the site visit they had 2 panels set up. He feels that they should show the panels as well as the fencing, the fabric over the fencing, and the vegetation and also review the decommissioning plan. Z. Lissard states that their objective on those renderings were to show that the higher fence, the lower panels and the vegetation coverage. M. Gyarmathy states he was looking for when they get these renderings of the vegetation. Typically, the Board asks for more than 1 location, of their viewpoint. These just show the entrance to the facility. He asks what about beyond and before the actual entrance to the facility? He states that he expected more viewpoints. Z. Lissard asks if there is a number that the Board can provide to them. M. Gyarmathy states he doesn't think the Board asked that of them. He thinks they could have given the Board a few more viewpoints than they did. M. Fingar states in their opinion they were not asked that. It wasn't agreed. They provided video, which is any viewpoint along that way. M. Gyarmathy states it's pretty much only one angle shown. He doesn't think can get an accurate depiction of what they are going to see if you're driving by. Z. Lissard states they are happy to provide additional viewpoints however he does not feel it requires a lot of renderings. They took the last point looking down on Mr. Eichorst's property. If there are other residences or viewpoints the Board would like he would just request them for clarifying. C. Baker states there was one additional comment in my letter that was not responded to. It was regarding SEQRA and one of the things that he suggested was some additional viewpoints considered viewpoints. He even suggest the possibility on Sodeman Road. There is a large lot over there that is pretty open. To go along with the visual is obviously a little wider. It probably is the largest objection. The more information provided the better. Z. Lissard asks what page is the question on. C. Baker states that it is the very last page of page.

18. The applicant has provided full environmental assessment form of supplemental visual information the Board should consider if additional viewpoints should be included. He saw them in road to talk about so remember road is a bunch of trees at a hill, they looked at that doesn't go to the road, you just see the side of the hill. That's why they didn't submit one concern in the road because it was on the side of the hill. But they can they can provide whatever the Board wants from them they are more than happy to provide that. C. Koenig states one of the parcels that's from the road up the hillside going up, there's a pipeline. Then facilities are on the other side. Z. Lissard states they are happy to do as many as the Board needs or wants is there any viewpoint that the Board wants to see, we're happy to accommodate. M. Gyarmathy asks what the height of them is. Are they 6' or 5' or 10' What He thinks C. Koenig was discussing that earlier? Z. Lissard states the pictures were taken at 5' and 10' approximately normal height profiles. M. Gyarmathy states if someone is riding in their truck in a truck that is what they will see. Z. Lissard states yes, and even lower in a car. M. Gyarmathy asks that's what that video was. Z. Lissard states they tried to project driving on that road. And when he joined real fast down the road, looks like a blurry tree. That's what they are trying to recreate what a viewer will see. C. Koenig what perspective is the Board looking for more, we did show one looking less down the road, the rest were pointed towards the site because that's where the panels are. If you're looking straight down the road some of the sites have further direction. M. Gyarmathy states, in the past, the

Board has asked the applicant to go onto the neighbor's backyards, take a picture and show the neighbors what they will see. This is a big scary thing for every one of those neighbors around that facility. That would be a great way to show the neighbor's what they're going to see. What the Board did that with Skidmore. C. Baker states that is consistent with what the Board requested, so they are staying consistent. M. Fingar states they can provide that. M. Gyarmathy states even up on the top of the hill and all the surrounding properties. M. Fingar asks if that's the request, they are happy to provide that previously, the Board asked the applicant to provide renderings. He states he understands and he is just trying to clarify a little bit. R. Roeckle asks because, he is not sure how computer program work, they are assuming he has a good camera view that he can just move it around, he can then just plot that based on wherever it is on a site, groundwork to validate the plot, and he can just like move the camera view to different locations. Z. Lissard states if there's specific elevations the Board would like to see, they took it from high level assuming most people were observing, driving, or something like that. M. Fingar states they are trying to figure out what the Board wants. Just to be clear, the videos specific because they work with different types depending on what it is. T. Yasenachak asks were those taken from the elevation of the road or the elevation, at the property. Fingar states it was taken at the driveway. I spoke today. C. Dake states he was surprised. he thought that they were going to cover more. The paradigm was informative to him and he appreciates that. T. Yasenachak asks the Board how they feel they have received additional information. Since they received that information, the Board can have the opportunity to reopen the public hearing to allow the public to comment on the new information that was provided. She states the Board can ask for additional information after they reopen a public hearing. J. Sabanos states that he feels that the Board should wait to hear from the residents before they ask the applicant for any additional information. T. Yasenachak opens the public hearing at 9:11 p.m. So Sir, I believe he had his hand raised as I was talking, so I will let you go ahead. Your name and your address for the record. Fred Brown 359 Locust Grove Road. His question relates to item number 12, the noise issue, they addressed audible noise, but they didn't talk about radiation noise from the equipment, the equipment that converts the DC voltage to the AC, and at the high voltage is going to be really powerful. This will cause significant interference if it is not addressed. If that is the case, he happens to operate emergency communications broadcast. It would be wiped out in order to produce noise. We (the residents) just need to know that there is a mechanism in place to make sure that the radiation is not creating interference. The second thing is there going to be taking care of the problem because he can't go bouncing back and forth between multiple people to find out who to take, care of the issue. Kathryn Walsh 353 LaRue Road can the additional visual renderings include her backyard? James Wimet 400 Middle Grove Road asks when the Board responds to the residence letters, because he hasn't heard any conversation amongst the Board as to any action taken. T. Yasenachak states this is not a time for dialogue. But I will address the process and she asks the Town Attorney B. Reichenbach to comment on this. T. Yasenachak states the Board does read those comments. They take them into their own personal. The Board takes those into account any of those comments, but they don't have a dialogue to answer every individual's specific comments. B. Reichenbach states the residents have a good, competent diligent Board here. There are some who aren't so diligent or competent. They take of your correspondence, your comments into account and that effects their total consideration of the project. You (the residents) heard M. Gyarmathy tonight, his biggest concern is what you folks all heard in his comments. That's the reason this is a second public hearing, which isn't typical. For a project and probably be at least one more public hearing. There have been projects in this town with 6. The Board as taking the residence accounts into consideration. The fact that they're not responding to each of the residence comments personally, doesn't mean they're

not hearing the residents and putting that into their analysis, and therefore the Board is it's just not feasible to do with everybody who writes the letter or makes a comment. J. Wimmet states the town adopted a comprehensive land use plan on May 12 2005. The town can never be a better vision of Greenfield is primarily a rural and residential community that's covered Comprehensive Plan recommended reducing the number of zoning districts in the Town established the Medium Density Residential the solar project that is proposed is for property located within that MDR result. The Comprehensive Plan also identifies that Porters Corner and Middle Grove as having the most potential for residential growth. In essence more people to help sustain the autonomy of the Hamlet's provide an increase in the tax base and support the Town by volunteering are running for positions on various Boards or Government Office. The Comprehensive Plan recommended in the past is the ability for Special Use Permits for various uses that would support future residential growth. Those services include conference, restaurants, convenience stores, laundry, office, complex customary facilities, etc. Each of those special uses provide jobs living wage, and generate revenue for the talents of the ever increasing expense needed to be dispatched. The proposal or project at this location is a Medium Density Residential zone with 10 existing residents does nothing to help provide lasting jobs or revenue growth over the next 45 years to potential Special Use Permit should be denied, it does not complying with the Comprehensive Plan and the standards that is required to be that by chapter 105- 54 brings a Special Use Permit subpart D. His letter to the planning board dated June 7 also referenced three additional standards required for the approval of Special Use Permit and includes the reasons why the applicant proposed project does not meet those standards as well. They are subpart F and he also has and he will submit tomorrow morning under a cover letter, a signed petition by 326 individuals that do not want this solar project to be at that site. Richard Menzhauser 389 Middle Grove Road. The Special Use Permit states that everything that gets done is supposed to be in harmony with the neighborhood and community. This level 3 solar farm it's not it's not in harmony with anything that goes on there. It's just you know, I don't know how this could even be proposed to be in a residential area it should not be allowed in this rural area. Pamela Menzauser, 389 Middle Grove Road. Also along the same things, the standard eight states that patterns and similarities and scales and designs in the neighborhood should be similar and stay close to the same base they will be compatible with existing structures within 500' of the site. Everything within the site is houses single family homes to still, they're all black, and no engineer, a building inspector, code enforcement officer, some state that would galvanize framing and press solar panels, you start getting rows and rows of elevation, like they have been showing what it's going to look at the road when you drive by first level, there's 100' of elevation change out in that hill. What is the top row going to look like. It just doesn't seem that it's not similar to the makeup of the existing residents of structures, which is something in the Town's standards. Lexie Markey 342 Middle Grove Road, standardize things, adequate screening, landscaping, exterior lighting, signs and architectural design compatible with the neighborhood and have the appropriate size and style provided to protect neighborhood properties within 500' of the site from adverse impacts that might result from the proposed use. The applicant from the very beginning has stated that their intent was to partially block the level 3 solar energy system facilities and to provide a team that blends in with the landscape, the applicants updated Site Plan in June does increase the number of trees and their size and install a lot of the hard work that they did show some of this, and it was increased 68', but the screen still does not block their percent of this. It also runs 2000' along Middle Grove Road. It's definitely not placing the trees immediately in front of the entire 2000 ' Middle Grove Road, they've chosen various locations at the rear of the two residential properties. Also in front of the western end of this system, there's still not enough trees and a sufficient height. She means, there were some and the Board has no an idea and she has no idea how it's going to work, the progress is still very scary. She thinks one of the Board Members also mentioned this is very scary to her. She states being one of the immediate residents around this and people around it. They did put a considerable amount of work trying to show it, it doesn't show the elevation. It doesn't show how it is going to look. She actually got really emotional, looking at that it scared the crap out of her. Again, my land borders were a lot of all these roadways, all these things are in maybe for a lot of you, it's not in your face, but it's still in a presence of their



community. It's a big concern. She needs to feel much better about something like this being here by having a little more work in time things showing her this isn't a scary thing. Again, she's also worry about the how it's going to impact the property values of all these places that are surrounding this, how is it going to impact that? What about health concerns? She means, they have these giant things surrounding her property, they said it's going to make some sound, what's the sound going to be? Also, if you can hear it, is there different impacts of it? Do we really know how this is going to impact all of us health wise? This is impacting her Middle Grove family, and how it's going to impact them. She really would like things to have considered. She really wants the Board to think about what's the legacy we want to leave behind here for all of us. We want to promote things to help our community and make things better in the long run. At the same time, what is the legacy you want to leave behind for our families and the other people that want to come into our community? Dwaine Patnaude, 24 he would like to thank the Board for the opportunity to voice his concerns and opinions on the public solar farm as a property owner and a resident of Greenfield for now, 4 years, like several before him. He does want to emphasize his enthusiastic support for both renewable energy and as well as our nice neighbors. His concerns in opposition to the project though stem from the silence of relocation from a visual impact for the general public as well as the local population. Most especially really adjacent land owners really empathize with their properties education. It seems like it's a shame to him to waste the seemingly beautiful and valuable land for a field full of aluminum beams. Most concerning to him is the negative impact that this will certainly have on the adjacent property owners, who have in many cases been loyal, Greenfield taxpayer. As someone before him pointed out, it would be hard to believe that anyone meeting with a realtor in Saratoga area would ask to see a property staring effect of 18 acres of aluminum structure on grade one. Also found the management the tax revenue wouldn't be greater if that property was based on developing single family homes. His additional thoughts revolved around the rule of law, our Planning Board, wonderful group of people, the ordinances are in place that others have spoken much better than he can about this. Our town committees have the responsibility to represent and manage what has already been put in place. Also to address this request to allow variances, have targeting our beautiful Town, Greenfield's character that we've enjoyed for so many years here, like others, again, no spoken against this variance. He and his family have chosen to live here, people character, the schools, and the somewhat rural atmosphere. Please accept my opinion that while he supports renewable energy, business, growth and expansion, and basically, he vigorously and his family vigorously oppose this particular project at that location. Karen and Fred Lyon 362 Middle Grove Road, we believe we are going to be surrounded by this solar field, we don't want that. The main concerns that her husband and herself have about both solar fields. Their first concern is the screening proposed Site Plan submitted in June shows that 8 trees would be planted from within the 100' within the 100' of our property, that's is 62 trees total. These trees will be planted 20' on center not acceptable. There are 2 issues regarding the proposed vision blockage first issue, the eight trees will not cover the 226' of the rear of the metal panels, the 8 rows of panels behind their property as well as the majority of the 22 rows of panels to the right of their land, which is exposed. Their second issue is the 8 trees are not planted the required 100' back from their property that the zoning laws for this project requires. Second concern they have is the access road and trees are too close to the right of their property. The Site Plan also shows that the trees would be planted not on both sides of the access road instead of just along their road. Their third concern the temporary staging area also is not required 100' from their property. The drawing shows only 30' not that is not good or acceptable. Please remember to keep Greenfield green. John Mulligan, 94 Middle Grove Road, states he is not against an overall growth. His concern is with the screening proposed on June 21. The updated Site Plan for large scale commercial solar project does not include any trees along the western edge running South point of view is highly visible from his residents at 394 Middle Grove Road and for all residents at 400 Middle Grove Road the trees in front of the western portion of the commercial solar array, as well as those that need to be added to the western edge running South should be at least 18- 20' high. Without the height, the viewpoint of the above noted properties, this will may be sufficient to hide the commercial solar array Looking at the renderings, it seemed to match up with the drawing for that area that I'm

talking about on the West End, it seemed like the panels were further to the west than what the drawing was. That would eliminate the trees going up that side. He is wondering why the renderings didn't really match up to the drawing and also the pictures and they went by so fast, he didn't really get a good look because they want to make it look like a fireball by. Michelle Wagner, 410 Middle Grove Road her concerns are of the screen proposed replacement committed on endpoint for landscaping. As shown today, the schedule identifies three specific trees that will be used for screening they are at the 10' on center, Eastern red cedar, 5-6', space through 6-8' space on 10' center. This landscaping schedule also contains snow, one of which states similar evergreen trees species may be substituted. For those listed in the slide or time of the year planted constraints are experienced. Any evergreen trees facing persecution shall be approved by licensed professional landscaper, architects or engineers. This says that the tree species of any size can be submitted, if that is what the only thing that's available. For example, if the only thing available is or 2-3', that's what we're going to get stuck with. It seems to her that the approval for any substitution that has come from a Town Official that oversees the Permit issued for this project, the applicants only plan those specifically sizes and approve as a result of a Special Use Permit for use by the process. The thing is, is all the beautiful trees that would be planted it is going into the fall now. Planting trees is something that is a good effect. She states unless they have somebody overseeing the exact size the proposed trees by the company. John Hubbard 399 Middle Grove Road, he asks if the Board would consider a submission by the advocates of a fiscal and economic impact statement. Then there will be minimal impact to the Town for goods and services purchased by the contractor during construction and the installation of the solar system. It also stated delivery no impact on any of the Town's services as they will not be needed. The advocate however, did not provide an analysis of the impact that there would have on property values. It's already been referred (by a few different solar companies) a couple of times. The property values of the existing residents within factors on solar. He states that he is not technically in that 500', but he's pretty close to it. He feels that the property values will be lessened he genuinely feels that it's going to be the case. They want to know that to purchase a home at full market value here with an array like that. However they are he will be the first one to put a for sale sign up because he wants to make money on the prophet. He believes they should be required to update or provide an analysis of facing potential losses to residents. Mary Boldish 151 Middle Grove Road, she states that she stood in front of this Board 4 years ago, when the Board approves a business the Board ruined my life, make noise traffic has never been the same. Don't do, what you did to me to these people. Steve Labarron, 151 Middle Grove Road, he states that he has seen a lot of solar farms, but none in backyards. Mike Munter, 909 Murray Road, he states that he moved to Town 49 years ago. There are many principal issues of this project, he feels this shouldn't even be considered for this parcel, mainly just due to the nature, rural nature of our neighborhood, and potentially introducing truly an industrial or high density commercial looking facility in the workplace that doesn't belong. He states that he has just a couple of basic issues. The type of fence you know, isn't even rural in nature, chain link fence with screening, looks to him like commercial environment, security makes sense without you're going to do a fence, it's generally wood slotted, or something, most of the fences we see hold animals in that looks nice to look at the height of the fence. There was a point made about the height of the fence and screening from the road. However, the fence and the panels might be near the same height of the panels go up the hill, that's not a real accurate representation of what is truly going to be screen. Sound was brought up the radiation magnetic interference issues should be really looked at Technically, the sound humans here is different than the sound down there. And we have neighbors that have animals that are going to be living adjacent to this property. And do we know what that does to a horse, a dog, a pig, ect. He states that he doesn't know. The applicants should know that. The decommissioning is a big sticking point for him being a professional contractor and estimator. He wouldn't decommission that field for \$169,000 in 20 years, 25 years, and who knows what those rates are going to be at that time. The property values is a very good point. The Planning Board's role is certainly much, much appreciated and respected by their taxpayers and residents. The role of the Board's complex applications such as this, there are many levels that really need to be thoroughly considered. And a lot of this burden can be shared by the

Town Board, and the Town Engineer. The interpretation of the Comprehensive Plan, which we paid the dues, the Town should try to follow up. This project clearly doesn't comply. There are a lot of technical aspects that were brought up that he knows the Board is going to review. He is not going to reiterate all that. The decommissioning plan, he can't say, enough of the importance of this for the future, this Town and its residents. This bond is our only insurance, an avenue to recoup funds to decommission the solar panels if the owners are gone and they're certainly are different owners, I know this is the third company to consolidate on this property. They just as residents encourage you to take the adequate time, use the resources they have to properly get out all these questions and concerns. If approved as it will be an eyesore recognizable a mistake in their opinion that will forever and encroach negatively affects the character mistake charge in our opinion that will forever and close negatively affects the character charm and value. The gateway that he grew up in, and he would like his kids to see and enjoy the same way as we all thank you very much for the Board's time. Michael Drum 365 Middle Grove Road, the renderings that they had with the trees and the total solar panels and it was just trees it didn't show any solar panels. The panels are 8.5' tall and there is a 22' elevation and 20' elevation change. The pictures were taken from projects the backyard. We were taking a drug level that we saw someone writing from my house cables are going to be eight and a half foot tall. And we have a 22 foot elevation change that is over 30' height difference what he doesn't understand is how 4, 5, or 6' tree or even a 10 or 12' tree is going to cover that from his house. He had mostly people up on my deck when the Board did their walkthrough and they can see what he is going to be looking at out his front window for the rest of my life and what they're proposing here it's not going to conceal that mess they have to look at. They chose to live in this Town for a reason and they have paid money into this Town. The Board member's he assuming they live in Town and they don't want to live in a big city don't they choose to live in this Town. And there's a reason is because it is beautiful country. He's hoping that this does not fit. He doesn't want it there and he is not just saying that because it's across from his house. This does not fit and he isn't just saying that because it is right across from my house. North will be the only direction on his property that he can walk and not see this mess. When he looks to the east and to the south and out to the west. Every one of these 3 directions this will be right in his face the rest of my life. He knows that the Board members don't live there or not you have the consideration and compassion to think of the people that live in this community. There are no look at. And one of the goals that I just want to bring up and then he has done. He states that he knows a lot of the people in this and he has spoken to well over half a dozen local volunteer firemen. His first question to them was they have been trained in this. They were given a walkthrough at this one down on Denton road. That was pretty much their training. Several of the firemen were officers. Department, it's direct the firefighters at the fire. And I asked them, what are you going to do if you have to go to respond to something like this? Every one of them and told me what their answer to fighting this fire is, it's true. Because they said they're pulling, a main switch and stepping back. They're not going to fight these fires. They are not trained on walkthrough doesn't make a 2 hour walkthrough is not enough training for something of this nature. The firefighters are going to turn off the power up and watch it burn. Michelle Countryman, 379 Middle Grove Road, they came to the Town 34 years ago because of what the Town offered to have our rural business across the street and this will change the character of the community forever intermittently. John Munter, 500 Sodeman Road, he states that a perfect example is Quiet Run Farm he thinks haven't even taken into consideration, she is probably 15' above the road directly across from the site within the site that gain greater than 20'. So in her lifetime, even a 20' tree has never killed her view and have such a broad spectrum that they could never afford to plant. But you also have damage points from up on the ridge of Lake Desolation and how often does people like to recall properties of beautiful views, people have bought that land to build their home, because they had a view, part of that view is that field. The Board owes the consideration of all of those folks as well in

their decision. The screening representation, and the visual aren't accurate. It will prove that themselves, they have to, that's what they're known for. And the dynamic view and they drive 40 miles an hour, there's a lot of different vantage points that they can line up with the most amount of trees to represent that they miss representation that they going to have to live with forever. Be careful about the Boards acceptance of their vantage points, how truthful their renderings really are. Because they are going to be looking at that and if they don't think that they're definitely true renderings. The fact that the thing gets built and it's not looking like it was presented. The Board is going to have this room full again, coming back so let's make sure that mistake doesn't happen. Linda Knowles, 230 Lake Desolation Road they moved up here to this rural area because it is beautiful. They love where they live. When they moved up here, all that was here was the local general store and the corner post. In time the corner post closed. There isn't even a fine dining establishment. They love living in this area. She has worked in Latham for 38.5 years, going back and forth. I didn't know any of these people until I saw the times going up about the solar farm and I met Mike Drumm. She can't imagine living across from this solar farm. It couldn't happen to her because across her property is wood. Whoever owns that could decide to mow that all down and put solar panels on it and she would just hope that the Board will take into consideration aesthetic, because they do matter to people that live near that. She doesn't think that any of the Board members would want any of that anywhere near where they live. Joe Jagiello, 304 in Middle Grove Road he knows this isn't a direct representation of it. But like would like to make the correlation between this site the Kesselring on Murray Road. He got out of Navy last March and he believe that Kesselring site really shows what you can do with a solar site because realistically driving past you don't know the site's there. Everything's contained they went into a site initially when it went in, it was a very rural area that no houses were around. And they did a good job of buying up more land than they needed to, and planting more trees and many of the tools that you need, like a direct aerial approach just to see the size. And that's provided hundreds of jobs for many years, just a couple for construction. Not only that, but it used to provide power into the grid. He can tell you it was much more than 3.75 megawatts. He thinks that's what they should be using as a standard for that area. He knows that no one is in Greenfield Center, but there are next door neighbors. And that goes to really show what's possible and what's proposed. The Board adjourns the public hearing, at 9:56 p.m. T. Yasenchak states that they are not closing the meeting yet during the public hearing they are closing the portion where the public speaks. They still have the rest of their meeting to continue and they are working. They haven't adjourned their discussion with the applicant yet. The Board members discussed needing additional information and wanting clarification about items. She states that the Board can make a better detailed list for the applicants so that they can be more informed as they continue. She asks the this Board first what they would personally like to see so that they can be more informed going forward. J. Sabanos states he would like to see renderings, obviously, it's important for every single person's back yard to try and make some renderings that will show in trees after the leaves are gone. If you're only using evergreen, there's no loose ends here. Z. Lissard states we will be using evergreens. J. Sabanos states that he would like more information on frequency analysis and deconditioning. N. Querques states that for him it is the screening. He thinks they need to do more on screening, he would like to see renderings for 10, 15, 20, and 25 years. He would like to see more screaming as part of this plan. R. Roeckle along with those items, on the rendering, sometimes very difficult to see the solar panels themselves is there a way to color code the solar panels, although he understand they, they want to see what it's going to look like. They have heard several comments this evening. Is there a way to just like, show that they're, they're in a different color? So they can see

where the panels would be. There's a concern that they are not showing the panels and that needs to verify that. Z. Lissard states that they can remove the trees. R. Roeckle states this looks like it's understood to be some relatively simple to do. M. Gyarmathy states they spoke about the screening, and they spoke about getting views from each one of these neighbors that are adjacent to this project. And what they're going to see very, very important. And I'm not going to go on about it. Other Board members have spoken about it. He is curious about if they have any information about this interference, with the electrical magnetic interference, radio frequencies. Can they provide the Board with some information on that. They put solar panels on airfields, which have VFR's, there's a visual view at the airport to basically shoot in VFR they shoot up lasers and radio frequencies to direct pilots into land. M. Gyarmathy states that he is not an engineer, so he doesn't want to say and that is why he is asking questions. Z. Lissard states that they can provide that. He doesn't remember what type of fence they used in a similar project like this. He knows it was much smaller. He knows it was not chain link. He thinks it was wood. Maybe something that would be more in character with our community, more of a rural nature, like the residents described. C. Dake states what he would like to see is more what they can do on the screening as well. He does not feel as though I have too little information about what's currently proposed would look like he feels as though what you've shown the Board doesn't look good enough. He would be interested in seeing what more you can do for screening. What M. Gyarmathy said about the way the chain link fence makes a lot of sense to him. He never had time to give a lot of thought, but it makes much sense. Also, he would like to see more renderings he knows that they did this, if a car was going past their homes, and he knows they can do this by slowing the video down. because of what the town offered to have our rural business across the street. Conway states she has the same issues that the other Board members also get the road, the road character in keeping with our rural community with respect to a fence. K. Conway states that she has the same issues that the other Board members have, with keeping with the rural community, a wood fence. The noise aspect she would like more data on that. She states that she didn't realize there would be a noise component to this. She knows when they had other applications and other businesses come in, and that was a huge, huge issue and major studies upon studies were done. They were very thorough. She would like to see some, some real data there. C. Baker states he has nothing at this point. He will be doing a final detailed review in response to their letter on the storm water and the additional information. T. Yassenchak states that they have heard all the Board's comments, she's agree with my colleagues about better renderings, and some better screening, making sure that there is screening that they can see the screening, adequate screening from all the different properties, not just from the different vantage points that they showed us. For instance, you're looking down the street, of course driveway that is one very, very narrow view. When she see's something like that, it just makes her question it. She's not saying anyone's doing anything wrong? She would like to see more renderings, because that just seems very narrow point. She also asks the Code Enforcement, as far as she knows that they have those holes that are along the rendering showed those 5 poles ready there. She is not exactly sure as far as coverage, just counting the polls knowing that they are a part of this system, part of the structural system, and they're connected with system. Is just counting the poles accurate enough? She asks our Code Enforcement Official to perhaps look at the Code, the Zoning Code in the engineering process and review the new coverage areas. The percent of the rezoning accuracy. M. Waldron asks is this new and more than 15% coverage? When that gets reviewed, perhaps they can have more discussion about what the Code for solar does talk about system structures. Perhaps they can get an interpretation from the Zoning Code Enforcement about that because she is not comfortable with 14.95% coverage. There's always a little bit more, she bring projects before Zoning Boards all the time. When they're built, there's always an overage, because you can't build something to a point of 05 % accuracy. So I'm a little concerned about how close they are with that coverage. The renderings she agree with her colleagues about the locations, also about perhaps the accuracy. Perhaps when they do

something in the renderings, they can put some other frame of reference of one of the renderings had a mailbox. And the mailboxes in the county has to be I think, 42" high. Yes, the trees at first planting at 6' high, a lot taller, even though they were significantly further away. She would like that fine-tune, it just didn't seem accurate. If it was skilled at 5' and he at the road and they moves the tree, that would end up in perspective being a taller tree than 5' when it was 20' away. So just look at that and look for a little bit more accuracy. She agrees with her colleagues about the reviewing the type of fence, she is curious, we did have some concerns and comments about the frequencies and the sound. Even though there's ambient noise. It's perceived differently at different frequencies. Sometimes a sound even though it's well below the ambient noise can be a frequency that is interpreted and heard and felt differently. She never really thought about that in such an array, because the last one that the Board did really didn't have residences this close. She would be curious about that. Someone mentioned that there is a note about the replacement of trees and substituting. And if the Board and when they continue our review of this, she is not comfortable with that. They have had other tree plantings on different types of projects in this Town and the Town is not an does not have job position of policing size of trees and figuring out who can do what and it needs to be able to, they need to be able to have a tool that can look at as far as substituting trees, They are not going to have Code Enforcement go out every time a tree dies, oh, this is too short. They need to be more black and white, in my perspective, going forward, or like that note to be removed. That way its black and white and Code Enforcement can drive by that tree is 3', it needs to come out you need to put a 6' tree that sort of thing. To be more specific about the height, still have some flexibility and species. As long as if it's something that's still evergreen, that would still have the same circumference at certain ages, she would be comfortable with that. The Board has seen trees planted this tall, when they're supposed to be much taller, and they get to 4', If a tree that is 10' tall and it dies it needs to be replaced with the same size tree and same species or like the same species. Z. Lissard states that they will replace with the same species. T. Yasenachak states at the height when died. B. Reichenbach states that he will review the deconditioning plan. T. Yasenachak asks if it will go to the Town Board for the bond. C. Baker states the Planning Board reviews the number and if it gets passed/approved it will be passed on to the Town Board that comes later in the process. T. Yasenachak states in here experience, the Board can make it contingent on a bond for a security that's approved by the Board. It would be contingent on the applicant reaching an acceptable level of security. The way we do it, we will review the numbers and make recommendations to the Town Board for the deconditioning plan. She asks if it is more as a contingency of sorts, for instance in subdivisions. The Board typically, because the Board does not do too many large subdivisions that require bonds for roads. So typically, the Board would review it if and if they were it approved as a subdivision, and then that bond would be contingent on the bond being approved by the Town. R. Roeckle asks for pictures of the back side of the solar panels. K. Conway states the different elevations in the Town itself and that have different views. While the Board was walking the property on their field trip, there was somebody's house up there on that hill. There are other people or other residents of Town who would be looking from an elevator looking down onto that if you're looking at west toward Saratoga, she wonders if they could get the Board some renderings from that perspective. C. Koenig asks if the Board received anything back from the County about led agency and asks once the public hearing is closed does the Board do SEQRA. T. Yasenachak states they received a letter from the County and they did not request lead agency and that the Board, likes to be as informed as possible before they do SEQRA, we don't necessarily have a decisive or just definitive time on when we close our public hearing until they count an application complete they have done SEQRA. Once they have closed the public hearing, then they actually have a timeframe in which they have to make a determination. They don't want to do that if still they go through SEQRA. Sometimes when they are going through SEQRA, they may ask the applicant for information, or perhaps when they doing their review, the applicant will hear their review the Board may ask the applicant's agents for more information. And at that point, we don't want to be under the time frame starts. They just can't count application complete till they do it. C. Koenig asks if the Board is closer to their SEQRA review. T. Yasenachak states that she thinks that they might be doing closer. For the

audience, the Board does not need a complete application to do SEQRA Review, and they definitely have enough information to start. But it is often how the Board feels if they have enough information to make an informed decision. They possibly could start she would say, to starting it tonight would not be appropriate to start tonight. J. Wimmet asks what SEQRA is. T. Yasenchak states she does like to be transparent in the process. And so the question was what a SEQRA review is. So it's Short Environmental, Quality Review Act, which is regulated by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, that when they have certain projects of a certain size in nature in front of a Board, they have to do environmental review. They did do one tonight, that was very quick for a subdivision. It looks at potential impacts being small or large for various environmental impacts. Huge long list, and the applicant has submitted their part one, which is on file that people can go and look at it, they can request a copy, I believe. The applicant does the first part and then the Board does the second part and they review and see what the Board feels if something is large or small. Once we go through that the Board can determine based on the information that they receive, based on their review, if it's a small impact, or if it's a large impact into large impact, an applicant would have to do an environmental impact statement of how that would be a how those impacts would be mitigated. And if there we find that there are no negative effects, and no large impacts, then the applicant would have to an environment impact statement on how that would be mitigated. If there would be declared a negative declaration which would say no large impacts. Then they can continue with a review as possible determination for any project. J. Wimmet asks if that is that is not part of environmental study. Will the Board have the applicant update that? They did what the impact would be for the Town. He didn't do the fiscal impact for the neighborhood. T. Yasenchak states that she doesn't know how that involves the Planning Board because they are a Land Use Board. They look at the Town's Zoning Regulations and their Comprehensive Plan and things of that nature. She asks B. Riechanbach in general not specific for this particular application, But as far as this board's purview of looking at financial impact. B. Riechenbach states that he does not have the instant knowledge to tell him whether that's in the criteria for a Special Use Permit. If it is the Board should consider any evidence that the applicant would care to provide. It's not in the Board really should not consider things that are not within the scope of the item they should look at to make the determination. That and that is part of the application process. And they've heard your concerns as well. It's up to them to determine at what level they want to respond to those concerns. T. Yasenchak states if anyone wants to look on the Zoning Regulations. And our Special Use Permit process is online, it's listed. So they can see all of the items that they are tasked with reviewing. So sometimes an applicant may give us additional information that's not part of that list. And it's not necessary, they can look at it, but it may or may not be something that we can look at to actually frame our determination. So we're looking at the list. That's what the Board is tasked with doing. Any submittals need to be in the office 10 days before, because they do need to disseminate the information. Some of our staff will be on vacation. Submittals are accepted at least 10 days before our meeting that they can get you back on the agenda. That concludes that portion of the Planning Board.

---

## **DISCUSSION**

T. Yasenchak s states this application is in front ZBA. At the last meeting he was in front of the Board. They question the density of his project. They realized that there was not enough engineering information for this project. They received advice from Town Council that they could go through SEQRA process, the ZBA does not do SEQRA process because they do not have the history and the knowledge to do so to be lead agency for SEQRA. They sent it back and they thought that the ZBA and thought they had enough information to move forward with their application. She reads the ZBA's resolution from their June 3, 2021 meeting. R. Roeckle asks if G. McKenna turned in a long form SEQRA. T. Yasenchak states as they move forward they will ask for it. The applicant can give them

as much information as they choice to and the Board can move forward with what is provided to them. R. Roeckle states if the Planning Board does SEQRA and the ZBA grants approval for this project the Planning Board has already don SEQRA for this project. T. Yasenchak state that they have done SEQRA for the information that they already have. If they receive additional information that changes there review she believes that they can re-open SEQRA. They have made their decision based on one thing and if something else comes up then it does. R. Roeckle states at this point they could be doing SEQRA just for the ZBA. T. Yasenchak asks B. Riechenbach if he could find out what the process if the Board reviews SEQRA for the Board for the Special Use Permit and the Variance. M. Gyarmathy asks if B. Riechenbach could also find out if the property values could go down because of this sola project, because a couple of the residence asked that question tonight. T. Yasenchak states in general the Board should not talk about specific projects. M. Gyarmathy states in general for most people your house is the biggest purchase that anyone will ever make and for the Board to not consider the impact on these residences near this project and the effect that it will have on these property values he feels it is a mistake not to take that into consideration. He would like to know how because a lot of what the Board does in environmental according to Zoning Laws and their Comprehensive Plan, but certainly this isn't talked about. He thinks in some instances it's a big issue. B. Reichenbach states that he does not know if it's the municipality, the applicant or the residents, He was talking to M. Waldron about something similar today and he does not want to answer that question because he does not know the answer to it. M. Gyarmathy states that he understands the Board was asked the question and he wants to know how to address this concern. B. Riechenbach states in general the Board can look at the Zoning Laws and they can't consider anything else. M. Gyarmathy feels if the Board does not take this into consideration then the Board will have a serious problem. B. Riechenbach states that he suspects that in the Boards Special Use Permit Laws is where they will find it. T. Yasenchak states if it is in the Zoning then the Town Board has said something is allowed, however maybe it's in the Comprehensive Plan allows the Board to at least look at it at the perspective. The fiscal responsibility from that perspective. J. Sabanos states that fiscally he can certainly that and that is off the NYS website. B. Riechenbach state that it can be interrupted that way. M. Gyarmathy states that he did some research and these residents of our Town have a legitimate complaint. He did some research and it is substantial that is why he thinks the Aboard needs to consider this. J. Sabanos agrees. M. Gyarmathy state the he knows for some of these folks that spoke tonight that their house is the major investment so he would like to know how to address it. T. Yasenchak states if they go back to consistency with Community Plan and how it should be developed at some of these questions (in SEQRA) the density, the characteristics of it. It may fall into that. It's about how they are using their terminology may find a way to answer M. Gyarmathy's question. M. Gyarmathy states there is no way to express themselves. T. Yasenchak states that there is an interpretation on how to find things. M. Gyarmathy states that h would still like the Town Attorney to look into it. K. Conway states that she knows that M. Gyarmathy is not going to like what she is going to say, but these people have no right. It isn't their property. She asks what right they have. M. Gyarmathy states that he understands that from a legal perspective and he is a firm believer that everyone has the right to do with their land as they wish in accordance with the Zoning Law. He wouldn't want all thon these people coming and telling him what to do with his property, but when it has a negative impact on their one and only investment. K. Conway states that she lives in Town too and she probably lives closer to that than he does. M. Gyarmathy states she does. C. Baker states that he thinks the bigger problem is NYS and if Nyserta has their way they are going to stream line this. M. Gyarmathy states that it's unfair because it affects the Community as a whole. C. Baker states that it is on the horizon. T. Yasenchak states that it kind of the same level as, when they did the cell tower, you know, and how it was going to impact people in the view and the rural character. Now, they can't even say anything about it anymore. The Board can't say anything about it going through and it's more or less like a rubber stamp. R. Roeckle



states that most projects coming in front of them are maximizing the acreage on a property. K. Conway asks if someone can explain to her when the Board was talking about that other guy. R. Roeckle asks is it Provost. K. Conway states he bought that little section of property that nobody could ever do anything with. T. Yasenchak states that's not true. They could. K. Conway states its land locked. T. Yasenchak states Open Development. K. Conway states that he found that use for it by the moving the driveway. She felt like I was like, the odd man out tonight. You can't do anything with that property. She doesn't get it. She doesn't have a problem with what he's proposing. He just needs to provide us more information. She is just going to say that seriously. That's not everything. She really wanted to say much ado about it. He got more permission for a Minor Subdivision. But he kept. The Board went through that process. B. Riechenbach states that he found a factor for M. Gyarmathy it's in Zoning Code 105-54 G. He states that he will send an email to Tonya regarding this so they don't have to dig around for it. The propose location and height of buildings or structures, walls and fences, parking loading and landscaping shall be such that it will not interfere or be encourage appropriate development of land adjacent to the proposed site for unreasonably effective value. If the Boards find that it unreasonably effective value, the Board can factor that into your decision. He would suggest like for anything else, if you're going to factor in your decision, there's got to be support in the record because they noted in the article 78 will close immediate one way or another.

---

Meeting adjourned at 10:42 p.m. All members in favor.

---

Respectfully submitted by,

Kimberley McMahon  
Planning Board  
Administrative Assistant