

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

**May 25, 2021**

**REGULAR MEETING**

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Zoning Board of Appeals is called to order by Robert Roeckle, Vice Chair, at 7:01 p.m. On roll call the following members are present: Karla Conway, Charlie Dake, Robert Roeckle, J. Sabanos, and Nick Querques. Butch Duffney is absent. Charlie Baker Town Engineer is present. Joe Sabanos has full voting privileges for the entirety of the meeting. M. Waldron, Zoning Administrator/Code Enforcement Officer is present.

**Minutes**

May 11, 2021

Minutes to be reviewed at the next meeting.

Dake, K. Case #640  
TM# 138.—2-86

516 Locust Grove Road  
Minor Subdivision

Karen Dake is present. C. Dake recuses himself. K. Dake states that she has 26+/- Acre parcel at 516 Locust Grove Road and she is requesting a 2 lot subdivision. She started out with a 3 lot subdivision, but changed it to a 2 lot subdivision with 1 lot a keyhole lot. T. Yasenchak states now you have a standard lot and keyhole lot. The larger lot wraps around another piece of property. They can't really help that, but she does have, but the applicant has a good amount of frontage on the other side. It looks perhaps it might have been an intent at one point. There is almost 90'. There is no setback issues with the house, with the leach field and the wells everything is a little bit easier. T. Yasenchak opens this project up for discussion between the Board. None of the Board has any questions for the applicant. T. Yasenchak states that the Board would like the sight distance at the driveway and your surveyor can provide that. K. Dake states I thought he already did that. C. Baker states that it is in a note. T. Yasenchak states I missed that. T. Yasenchak states when we do get to SEQRA review one of the items needed to be revised. Whoever filled out the SEQRA for you used an older form. You can go online and to EAF Mapper and it will fill it in automatically. K. Dake states ok. T. Yasenchak states the only thing that would be changing would be she believes that it is the long eared bat. C. Baker states it looks pretty straight forward. T. Yasenchak states on a minor subdivision a public hearing is not required, it is something that is per their purvue. Typically we do a public hearing on even on minor subdivisions. How does the Board feel? The board agrees and sets a public hearing for June 8, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.

Grassi, J. Case #647  
TM# 151.-2-57

369 Grange Road  
Sketch Plan Review Major Subdivision

Justin Grassi is present. J. Grassi states that a couple of weeks ago they responded to C. Baker's letter.

- 1. They first 4 had to do with frontage They will be responding to the Town 's Code Enforcement Office, Town Highway Superintendent and the Town Fire Chief. They are working with ACOE. They had an ecological company already delineate the wetlands and confirmed the location. They have modified the grading limit line.

C. Baker asks if there are revised plans, because he did not get any plans. J. Grassi states the only revised plans are the grading plans. The sheet should have been attached to the letter. C. Baker states nothing with the sight distances. J. Grassi states he submitted a 1 sheet that was attached to the letter . C. Baker states he received the letter, but no revised plans that shows the grading limits. Nothing with the sight distances . C. Baker states that he has that he is looking for the revised plans that shows the grading limits J. Grassi states no, that we have yet to provide it has been worked on. That is for purposes of understanding that the grading limits now incubus septic systems.

- 2. In addition to that we provided to the Board the shared driveway. So they want to clarify some of the items with the shared driveway. They also submitted a letter in support of why they believe in this instance the shared driveway makes sense. He is not sure if he clarified last time for the reason of the shared driveway. They have enough acreage and frontage for traditional driveways. What they wanted to utilize the existing part of that piece of property of the natural hill going up this way granting these 3 lots/homes views. The intent was to entwine this hill to get those views. That is the reason they have greater acreage. They could simply send it down but that does not provide one of that natural features of the sun. In Addition we have the opportunity as outlined in the letter this layout makes more sense. If they put a driveway thye are looking at 2 to 3 acre lots. The hill adds to the natural grade then it starts to taper off. It is for appearance sake. The shared cos of plowing and maintenance as well. Being an attorney he is familiar with shared driveways there are probably more likely failed shared driveways than not. A lot of shared driveways are based on the use. There is nothing recorded regarding the maintenance and responsibilities of all the parties. They will be outlining all of the responsibilities and rights. They have specific items in there that the lot owners wanted in it. These rights can be enforced by taking them to court, leans, and foreclosures on those properties. In some aspects this driveway is actually safer than when you have single driveways. Setting precedence. What he is proposing is a shared driveway that will be subjected to a number a specific plan. They have reasons for putting their houses in specific locations and the impact on trees. The Board really does not have any worries with setting precedence. He also notes that in specific legislation one of the suggestions just showed traditional driveways. Legislation requires that it can be an approved alternative driveway. Along with reviewing the shared driveway he also had an opportunity to speak with the Highway Superintendent, Justin Burwell. He also indicated that he is also the fire chief. Based on what we are proposing he has no objection to this. He asked if that could be put in writing. He stated no , but he will have a conversation with M. Waldron. In addition he will be sending this to the fire chief along with an easements will be publicly recorded and accessible to anyone individual trying to buy a lot and it will be reviewed by Town Council. It will be in the actual deed itself. He proposes clearly marked the signage in front and each house will be clearly marked for emergency vehicles. The shared driveway will be built to the Town regulation allowing 35,000 ton vehicle. That is why this design does make sense.

We strongly recommend that the Planning Board approve this. The goal of tonight's meeting is to provide additional information and set a public hearing and declare the Planning Board lead agency for this project. T. Yasenchak asks K. McMahon and M. Waldron where are they as of application process. Has he submitted the application itself as far as a major subdivision. It is still noted as Sketch Plan Review. M. Waldron states that we have this as a 15 lot subdivision, not 14 lots. T. Yasenchak asks if J. Grassi is in front of the Board for Sketch Plan Review she is wondering where they are in that process. She knows where they are as far as their book goes for subdivision review. If the Board is looking at Sketch Plan Review or are we looking at giving them preliminary review. That also changes in where they are as far as public hearing. J. Grassi states that in December 2020 they were in front of the Board for conceptual sketch plan review which was granted. They supplemented that application on March 30, 2021 with a preliminary plot approval and they have paid the fees for a 15 lot subdivision. M. Waldron states all fees have been paid. T. Yasenchak states that it has been paid beyond sketch plan. M. Waldron states yes. T. Yasenchak states that the plan the Board has in front of them so that they are all referencing the same plan that has grading which is on the back of the letter. It looked different from the grading on the larger plan they have in front of them. There seems to be a lot more grading it looks like it is because of the area that needed to be cleared for sight distance. The map she is looking at is different than the map with the letter. She wants to make sure where the clearing is and what the limits of clearing are. J. Grassi states understood. He will update and modify the maps. T. Yasenchak states that for discussion for tonight they are to be looking at the one with the letter. J. Grassi states correct. R. Roeckle states the large lot in the back is his biggest concern. He knows that there is a little strip of land and runs along the south side of the property and where they can access it. He is not happy about that but if M. Waldron agrees with it is all part of one lot. He would rather see that be split up between the 3 lots because someone could think they could develop it. His other question is do they have the postal addresses for this lots. J. Grassi states that he does not know if they have them. K. McMahon states that it is her understanding that it does not get done until after the approval and they get it back from the County. R. Roeckle states that our Code states that the addresses are to be on the map before it is signed and approved. T. Yasenchak states right before it is signed. As far as their review we don't need to have that now. R., Roeckle states that it needs to be on a map. T. Yasenchak agrees before she signs the mylars they will make sure they are on. M. Waldron states that he is glad that was brought up because he has had some conversations with the assessor. R. Roeckle states that could be done on this specific road if they had multiple roads it wouldn't work. M. Waldron states that he will speak to the assessor and get back to the Board. N. Querques states that he appreciates the justification on the shared driveway. He still does not like it for the reasons that the Board has shared with them, he does not have any other comments at this time. J. Sabanos asks who/what determines what specific school the residents child will attend. T. Yasenchak states that they look at the map and where they are located and there are specific school boundaries. It is not the Planning Board it is the school district. J. Sabanos states that his concern is that they bring in these new subdivisions and they maybe shoehorning out homes that have been here for 100 years. K. Conway states that when they go to register (for school) they will send them wherever they can fit them. M. Gyarmathy asks if J. Grassi could review the sloth of that lot that will be attached to the back parcel. He thought there was other alternatives. J. Grassi states that there are intentionally unlimited options as far as it was their personal preference. The entire rear would connect to lot 12. He understands that it would look strange on a tax map. M. Gyarmathy asks how wide is the sloth of land there. J. Grassi states he believes they have depicted as 10'. It could be whatever the Board wanted. It can be anything they wanted it can go to any of the 3 lots there. M. Gyarmathy states that he thought that one of your family members were going to be on the cull-de-sac. They will be. That one is the one that they are envisioning his parents will own. They can certainly take a look at other options if the Board

would like. M. Gyarmathy states he would like to see a lot that is closer to it. Overall this Planning Board does not favor shared driveways. He appreciates the fact that he made the shared driveway 30' wide. He feels that is very important. He will continue to think about your use of it. C. Dake states that he is not uncomfortable with the way it is. He feels that it will be preserved and understands the reasoning for it. K. Conway asks why the strip is not being attached to one of the other lots. J. Grassi states that the thought process behind it is essentially the 3 brothers would be there. They wanted to keep that property in the family and use it as trail space.

---

AEC Solar Energy Case #649  
TM# 150.-2-32.23

47 King Road  
SUP/SPR

George Jolly and Adrian Donnelly are present. T. Yasenchak states that this project is ground mount solar. G. Jolly states this is a small solar project for his home. It will be placed in the back of his property. He provided a letter from a neighbor (with the application) in favor of the project. A. Donnelly states this project is small and it will actually be done with a hand auger. They will be digging a 18" trench and it will be 70' from the nearest property. T. Yasenchak asks if there going to be a fence around the property. A. Donnelly states no fencing. T. Yasenchak states usually the Board requests that the framing be darker, but they can waive that. They do have a letter from the neighbor in favor of this project. She asks for a data cut sheet showing no glare. The FAA usually has a cut sheet about the glare. A. Donnelly states not a specific rating. He did ask the sales manager and he did not have one. T. Yasenchak states that other solar company's provide them to the Board. It is something from the FAA. Because this is a Special Use Permit/Site Plan Review the Board has to have a public hearing. G. Jolly states this is just a small project why do they need to have a public hearing. T. Yasenchak states that it is how the Town Law is written. The Board has to treat all Special Use Permits the same. If the Board agrees we can set it for June 8, 2021. N. Querques asks who will own the panels. G. Jolly states I will own the panels. T. Yasenchak states that she appreciates the complete application and the Board agrees to waive the color of the framing. A. Donnelly states they can provide a dark gray galvanized color for the framing. T. Yasenchak states no that is fine. The Board sets a public hearing for June 8, 2021.

---

Meeting is adjourned at 8:07. All members are in favor.

---

Respectfully Submitted by,

Kimberley McMahon  
Planning Board Administrative Assistant

---

Meeting adjourned at 8:07 p.m. All members in favor.

---

Respectfully submitted by,

Kimberley McMahon  
ZBA Administrative Assistant

DRAFT