

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

May 1, 2018

REGULAR MEETING

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Zoning Board of Appeals is called to order by Denise Eskoff, Chair, at 7:00 p.m. On roll call the following members are present: Denise Eskoff, Curt Kolakowski, Laura Sanda, Joe Szpak, Andrew Wine and Neil Toussaint, Alternate.

Minutes

April 3, 2018

MOTION: J. Szpak
 SECOND: L. Sanda

RESOLVED, The Zoning Board of Appeals waives the reading of and accepts the April 3, 2018 Minutes with minor corrections.

VOTES:

Ayes: D. Eskoff, C. Kolakowski, L. Sanda and J. Szpak
 Noes: None
 Abstain: A. Wine
 Absent: None

Stewart's Shop's Case #997
TM# 138.-1-34

Area Variance
2532 Route 9N

No one is present from Stewart's Shop's. D. Eskoff states that the Applicant put in two (2) new signs in 2015 following the ZBA granting the Applicant's request for an Area Variance three (3) years ago. At that time, they were allowed to keep them as internally lit. Our Code does not allow for internally lit signs. These were pre-existing non-conforming signs. Stewart's Shops replaced the main sign with one LED inset. At the same time, they were also before the Board for the Stewart's Shop in Middle Grove and they replaced that sign also. This sign on Rt. 9N was enlarged by a foot. The sign on the face of the building at that location was also replaced because they changed their logo to include a swoosh under the lettering. They came with predetermined sizes that were the smallest sign that they made. The Board approved it. The Board does not know what Stewart's is looking to do with the sign replacement now and no one from Stewart's is present this evening. D. Eskoff states that was originally done in 1992. The Board does not have any pictures. Last time they submitted drawings and photos and someone was present to discuss the Application. There is no one present tonight. She would be inclined to table the Application and request more information. J. Szpak asks the Board what information would they like. They want to know what the new sign will look like and the dimensions will be if they are different than what is currently there. L. Sanda states that the

Board needs to know what sign is being changed - the Application says sign and size. Which sign, how many signs? A. Wine states that the implication is either they are taking about what they have there and upgrading it. D. Eskoff states that it does not meet the size requirement but otherwise the Board does not know particularly what they are looking for, she does not understand why they are doing it because they just replaced it in 2015. The large sign is a multiple sign it lists everything that is in that plaza. A. Wine asks if they changed it recently. They used to have to have to manually change the price of gas. D. Eskoff states that when they did the previous sign change Stewart's Shops asked for the LED insert so they would not have to do that.

RESOLUTION: Stewart's Shops – Area Variance – Case #997

MOTION: J. Szpak
SECOND: A. Wine

RESOLVED, the Zoning Board of Appeals tables the Application for an Area Variance for Stewart's Shop's, Case #997, TM# 138.-1-34, until their June 5, 2018 meeting at 7:00p.m.pending receipt of the following information by May 22, 2018 to be submitted to the Greenfield Building Department/ZBA:

- Additional information on which sign(s) they propose to change including the reason for change since 2015 signage was installed
- Drawing(s) of proposed new sign(s)
- Size and exact dimensions of proposed new sign(s)
- Photo examples of proposed new sign(s)

VOTES:

Ayes: D. Eskoff, C. Kolakowski, L. Sanda, J. Szpak, A. Wine
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

RESOLUTION: – Area Variance – Case #997

MOTION: J. Szpak
SECOND: A. Wine

RESOLVED, the Zoning Board of Appeals accepts the application for an Area Variance for Stonybrook Preservation & Development, LLC, Case #999, TM# 164.-1-50, pending receipt of the following information by June 19, 2018 to be submitted to the Greenfield Building Department/ZBA:

VOTES:

Ayes: D. Eskoff, L. Sanda, J. Szpak, A. Wine
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: C. Kolakowski

D. Eskoff states this Application is an Area Variance for a three (3) lot subdivision on Bockes Road in MDR- 2. The Applicant would like to have three (3) lots but if they do so one (1) of the lots will be substandard in acreage, Cecil Provost is present for the Application. D. Eskoff asks if this is in development stage. C. Provost states that he owns Saratoga Construction Homes and Pro Realty in Saratoga. He used to be a resident of Greenfield and has done a lot of work in Town. He is under contract to purchase. It is a 7.3 acre parcel. Zoning requires three (3) acres per lot in MDR-2. They have plenty of frontage. D. Eskoff agrees. C. Provost states he is asking for three (3) lots. One (1) lot would be substandard and two (2) lots conform. People call their office everyday looking to build affordable homes. It is tough. He is hoping to build the homes and sell them as a package for under \$300,000. D. Eskoff asks if they will be modular homes. C. Provost states probably. D. Eskoff states that C. Provost submitted some comparisons and appreciates that. She does not think anyone has ever submitted this type of information since she has been on the Board. She asks which of the comparison properties indicated were pre-existing prior to the Zoning change, are they pre-existing non-conforming lots? C. Provost states that some of the lots have been subdivided since the change and some have not. D. Eskoff states she is not sure how much the Board can rely on the comparisons without more specific additional information but it does give a good picture of the neighborhood. C. Provost states that from the road no one will know that each lot isn't three (3) acres. D. Eskoff states that is a triangular lot, it is a difficult parcel. C. Provost states that it certainly won't change the character of the community in any way. On one (1) side the property borders railroad tracks. They are all modest homes all around the parcel. D. Eskoff states that the Board would like aerial photo information. L. Sanda states that yes an aerial map and photos looking to the road need to be provided. N. Toussaint asks if the property is currently woods? C. Provost states yes.

RESOLUTION: Provost, C. – Area Variance – Case #998

MOTION: J. Szpak
SECOND: L. Sanda

RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals hereby accepts the Application of Cecil Provost, Case #998, request for a side and rear yard Area Variance for property located at Bockes Road, TM# 138.-1-84.2, and sets a Public Hearing for June 5, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. contingent upon the receipt of:

- Photos of property including overhead and side view to be submitted to the Building Department/ZBA by May 22, 2018

VOTES:

Ayes: D. Eskoff, C. Kolakowski, L. Sanda, J. Szpak, A. Wine
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

Lochner, T. & J. Case # 995
TM# 151.20-1-19.1

Area Variance
8 Liberty Drive

Thomas and Jill Lochner are present. D. Eskoff states that the Board has held the Public Hearing open for this case since last month. D. Eskoff reopens the Public Hearing at 7:11 p.m. Since there is no one in attendance to speak for or against this Application and no correspondence she closes the Public Hearing at 7:11 p.m. D. Eskoff states G. McKenna has made a formal determination on their property. His determination is that this request is for a Garage Apartment. If the Applicants move forward with their plans, as submitted to keep it intact, it is a Garage Apartment not an In-Law apartment. Therefore, if the Applicants are amenable to G. McKenna's determination then to move forward they would either have to amend their current Application with the ZBA or start over on the request for an Area Variance for a Garage Apartment. The first difference is that a Garage Apartment requires 300' of frontage versus 200' of frontage for an In-Law Apartment. The second difference is the Applicants will need to apply for a Special Use Permit from the Planning Board that would go along with Site Plan. The third is they will have to work with the Building Department on the septic requirement issues. The Applicant could also withdraw their Application this evening and then resubmit it. They would have a new Public Hearing and it becomes a longer process. If they, instead, want an In-Law apartment they would probably have to look at redesigning and talk more with the Building Department. T. Lochner asks about the definition of a two (2) family home seeing that there are only two (2) things listed in the Town Code. Is it a vertical or horizontal fire wall which they already have. The fire Department required that. The other is to have enough parking spaces. D. Eskoff states the Board is going by what the Codes Enforcement Officer has stated to the Zoning Board for this evening regarding this Application – the determination is for a Garage Apartment. T. Lochner states the acreage is the same. D. Eskoff states that she does not have an answer regarding the 2 Family Home option and apologizes for the previous acreage confusion for two family requirements but she is not being able answer the two family question. She states that the ZBA has a letter from Codes Enforcement Officer, G. McKenna, stating that it was intended to be a Garage Apartment when it was originally built. It is not an In-Law apartment. Right now it is a house - a small single family house. They have an entrance, a stairwell, and the firewall. In G. McKenna's determination, the ZBA is now questioning an Area Variance for a Garage Apartment not an In-Law Apartment. That is what he has determined it to be. That is also what his note said when they submitted originally a number of years ago. At that time, G. McKenna said to go forward with requesting the Special Use Permit, however, it ended up being a single family home and they did not get to that step. It is in the Applicant's court at this point. T. Lochner asks would it be an Area Variance for a Garage Apartment. D. Eskoff states yes that is what the ZBA would be reviewing. J. Szpak asks how can they move forward. D. Eskoff explains the first way is by amending their Application if they so choose to accept that determination and submit it as a Garage Apartment and pursue it as a Garage Apartment - that is up to the Applicant. Or, they can withdraw it, think about it and resubmit it but that would set the Applicant back time wise. The Board would have to accept the new Application and set a new Public Hearing. J. Szpak questions if it could be a two (2) family and amend the Application for a two (2) family. D. Eskoff states that would be up to the Applicant to discuss with G. McKenna. G. McKenna made a determination to the ZBA that this is a Garage Apartment. The Board could also, with T. Lochner's approval, table this case and he can discuss this with G. McKenna. T. Lochner states the determination that it is a Garage Apartment asking from the Zoning Board's perspective does he need the frontage variance of 300' for the Garage Apartment and then he will start the build up with the Planning Board? T. Lochner asks if they can amend the Application tonight. D. Eskoff states yes they can. T. and J. Lochner amend the Application for an Area Variance to meet the needs for a Garage Apartment. D. Eskoff states to let the record note that T. Lochner has updated and amended his Application for an Area Variance for a Garage Apartment. The Applicants need a Variance of 286.34'. A previous Area Variance was granted when it was a subdivision for general building. The Codes Enforcer states that they need the actual frontage;

they have a large amount of acreage. A. Wine asks is this a situation where the addition, if approved, will play off the same existing well and septic or does a new well need to be drilled and a new septic has to be put in. D. Eskoff states that the Building Department will determine that. Those are Building Code issues. They will be determined through Building Code, Site Plan Review, and through the Special Use Permit process. They really are not ZBA issues. This is now a small single family house and they are building a very large home. The Applicant has stated that his septic is oversized to accommodate septic. The Board cannot sit in judgement of that because it is not within our purview. Typically a Garage Apartment has two (2) septic systems. A. Wine states that he is not asking as a considering factor merely as a substance of matter to lead him to wonder what they will be doing with the space over the garage they are currently living in. D. Eskoff states that the Applicants would have it as a Garage Apartment the way it is presented now. If the ZBA grants the Area Variance and if the Applicants are granted a Special Use Permit and follow through with whatever else they need to do with the Town, etc. for a legal Garage Apartment. The Area Variance portion for that will run with that property if used. Their intent now is just to have family live there. A Garage Apartment opens up more than an In-Law Apartment. A. Wine states that it could be used as a rental. D. Eskoff states there will be other considerations in the future if they wish to continue that's why Special Use Permits are involved with the Garage Apartments as separate entities. T. Lochner asks if the Special Use Permit only goes with the current owner. D. Eskoff states for the Garage Apartment yes, but the Area Variance will run with the land assuming it is used and they move forward with the project. Garage Apartments are normally detached from the home being above or in a few cases behind/on level of the garage. A Garage Apartment by Special Use Permit along with the variance would allow them to keep a separate entrance which is different than an In-Law apartment. If the Applicants first started building the house as they want it now they may have done something much differently to accommodate in-laws. It is a large lot, the Area Variance is simply a frontage issue. J. Lochner asks if the ZBA is able to determine if they can get the Variance frontage. D. Eskoff states the ZBA had an Application from the Lochner's for an In-Law apartment and there was some confusion because it is over a garage with a separate entrance. The Applicants wanted to keep it as a distinct unit within the house. Basically it was not fitting the definition of an In-Law Apartment. The ZBA didn't have the determination. They have the Garage Apartment determination now and the Board is moving forward with the Area Variance need for 286.34'. D. Eskoff states that the Applicants have a significant investment to add onto it. L. Sanda states that it is also important to note that it is a unique situation because they are funding these themselves. They built it this way because of funding reasons. They were not getting a loan to build the whole thing so they built a small portion first lived in it and now are preparing to build a home. It is not typically done this way. J. Szpak states the current situation is not self-created because of the way they got into the situation. The way the house was built in pieces for practical/financial basis. L. Sanda asks how long have the Lochner's been residing there? T. Lochner believes it was July 2015. L. Sanda states about three (3) years then they have been residing there. She feels that is important to note. D. Eskoff states the Building Permit was applied for as a Garage Apartment it ended up with a C.O. as a single family home. Their original intent was this all along and it is coming full circle with this determination. J. Szpak states that this is substantial but feels it is scaled back as much as possible. D. Eskoff states that it is pre-existing non-conforming frontage lot. It is a very large lot. It is 11 acres. L. Sanda states as far as change to the neighborhood, in the past there was concern about Garage Apartments and renting to students. She feels that this home was originally planned as a home to accommodate a large family. The number of people going in and out hopefully won't be substantially different. D. Eskoff states that the Special Use Permit process will probably look at this as well. This is not a situation where something was done without the Town knowing about it. The Town Building Department was involved in the beginning. A. Wine asks what will happen regarding environmental impact if the septic in fact is

not big enough. D. Eskoff states they will have to comply with Town Code for septic needs - that is for the Building Department and the Planning Board.

RESOLUTION: T. & J. Lochner, Area Variance - Case #995

MOTION: J. Szpak

SECOND: L. Sanda

RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals hereby grants an Area Variance for 286.34' frontage for a Garage Apartment as part of a new house for property located at 8 Liberty Drive, TM# 151.20-1-19.1, for the following reasons:

- The benefit cannot be achieved by other means feasible to the Applicant. It is a pre-existing non-conforming property.
- There is no undesirable change to the neighborhood character or detriment to the nearby properties.
- The request is substantial but it is pre-existing non-conforming and property scaled back to minimal frontage needed.
- There are no adverse physical or environmental effects.
- The alleged difficulty is self-created as the Applicants have resided there for three (3) years and seek to move forward with this project.

(The Garage Apartment will require a Special Use Permit per Town Code.)

VOTES:

Ayes: D. Eskoff, C. Kolakowski, L. Sanda, J. Szpak, A. Wine

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

**355 Grange Road Case # 994
TM# 151.-2-58.1**

**Use Variance
Grange Road**

Gerard McKenna is present for the Application. D. Eskoff states this case had a Public Hearing last month and it was tabled for continuance. At 7:35 p.m. D. Eskoff re-opens the Public Hearing. No one is present and asks the secretary if there is any correspondence. K. McMahon states no. D. Eskoff states that there being no correspondence or anyone present in favor or opposed she closes the Public Hearing at 7:35 p.m. G. McKenna has provided the Board with the requested financial information. D. Eskoff states that the Board did a site visit of this property on April 14, 2018 with several ZBA members present. In order to review this Application as a Use Variance, the Board needs to look at every use that could potentially be built or put on that property and whether or not it is financially feasible and reasonable. G. McKenna has attached a Use Chart for the ZBA for MDR-1. A. Wine asks if there is any outcome of the site visit. The Board proceeds to discuss. N. Toussaint states the front is bedrock and the back is not excavated. N. Toussaint asks who did the lot line adjustment. G. McKenna states that he did. D. Eskoff states that the portion of the property that was cut off was added to the mobile home park next door and created a larger buffer on the rear section of that property and restricted the area so something could be done in the front. It is also very swampy. G. McKenna states yes the whole back of the property is Army Corp. and it has been

delineated and flagged on the wetlands map. D. Eskoff states that the ZBA does not get many Use Variance requests. The last Use Variance was also for a self-storage facility. She believes that the Board has copies of that case. That case could be somewhat distinguished in that was a very small lot that was very limited as to what could be done with it. It was bordering the commercial area closely. They built a one strip self-storage unit which is self-buffering against the only residential house left in the nearby area. Certain things are conducive to that situation. There is another self-storage facility in Town on Route 9N and that was also put in previously by a Use Variance because it was not in an area that was allowed at the time. The two (2) self-storage facilities that are in Town were put there by Use Variances that are very hard to get. G. McKenna states that the only place in Town self-storage units are allowed is Stewart's plant area/Industrial. D. Eskoff states exactly. It's a hard level to achieve but they have to look at the individual District for that. When the ZBA goes through the criteria the financial is definitely a very important part of the criteria. Unlike an Area Variance, the Applicant has to meet each and every one of the criteria. There are only four (4) criteria but they do have to meet each of them. D. Eskoff asks the applicant where he would like to start. G. McKenna states there is a lot of information submitted. He feels it is self-explanatory and to feel free to read it and ask questions. D. Eskoff states that the Board members need take a very serious look at each and every one of the uses. G. McKenna states that he followed the Use Variance Guidelines used by NYS that happens to be the last part of the narrative. D. Eskoff states the ZBA asked and G. McKenna brought it up it is a residential section as it is supposed to be but there are some mixed uses there also. What is the cost to build a single family home, is it a desirable location, is it a desirable lot in addition to the cost of building a home. It is located next to an older mobile home park. A farm house on the other side. Another farm/farmhouse up the road. The driveway across the street is a modular home. There may be another home or two (2) close by. This is what is in the immediate neighborhood. A. Wine states that he does not feel it will change the character of the neighborhood. D. Eskoff states that G. McKenna has submitted the cost of a single family home and the cost of the land was \$35,000. The on-site work estimate from Joe Pita is \$137,000 for filling the lot, installing the septic system, driveway, and digging the utility line. Construction of a 3,000 square foot home – total investment \$562,000. Looking at where it is located, not only the type of lot, would anyone want to put a half a million dollars in a home on that lot right next to an older mobile home park. A. Wine states not logically unless someone was planning on doing something with the house later. D. Eskoff states that they would want to get their investment back. D. Eskoff states that land wise it is a very difficult lot. The bedrock is quite apparent. Even if you divide the lot in half it would be difficult to get someone to find that as a desired lot for that. J. Szpak states the assumption is that it is a \$562,000 investment. J. Szpak asks G. McKenna the size of the fill? G. McKenna states 7'. The narrative states 10,000 cubic yards. G. McKenna states that he would have to fill for the house as well. J. Szpak questions what foot by what foot is that fill for? G. McKenna asks of the actual square footage? J. Szpak states yes. G. McKenna states that he took it off of a design Paul Male drew for him of the septic system. J. Szpak states if he did 100'x100' (deep) area that would be 25,000 cubic yards. G. McKenna states that there is the septic area and a three (3) bedroom house. J. Szpak asks L. Sanda why 200? L. Sanda states the frontage on the lot is 273' divide it by 200. J. Szpak states they don't have to fill the whole lot. If you set the house on bedrock they would want some fill so it would taper down. L. Sanda states 7' of fill gets roughly 200'. That is what they are talking about for square area for 7' fill. C. Kolakowski explains cubic yards that were quoted would assume that the lot would be filled 7' high over a 200'x200' area. L. Sanda states that is more than enough for a septic and grading to tie it in. It is not unreasonable. J. Szpak states his point is that no one would ever do that. Someone would put a smaller house. No one would put 3,000 square foot home there and no one would put in 10,000 cubic yards of fill. Someone may put in 3,000. Why would someone do that? L. Sanda states that the septic cannot be built with 3,000 cubic yards of fill. The leach

fields have to be built and it needs a raised system and it has to have so much for infiltration. That would have to be built and graded down. It's not just going to stop. Plus they would want it graded out into the yard. They will not have a steep hill. She does not think that is unreasonable to make a yard. N. Toussaint states that 7' high is huge. JL Pita quote for 10,000 cy x 27=270,000 cf divided by 7' of fill =38571 sf divided by 200ft= 193ft. J. Szpak states 7' high are unreasonable. No one would do that. L. Sanda states what would go there and what would fit there and if someone would buy there. D. Eskoff states that is the question. What would fit there and who would buy there. G. McKenna states that 3,000 square feet is the average size house in Town that is being built now. The average price they gave the ZBA to figure was \$130 per square foot which is on the lower side because the average \$155-\$180. A. Wine states if the property was cut in half the cost would still be a demonstratively high cost for a single family house. D. Eskoff states it's whether it is a reasonable return. Is someone going to buy that house in that location, on that property at that price and get a reasonable return. C. Kolakowski questions what kind of house would go in here and the listing of building types as indicated by the Applicant as potential uses including a mobile home. A. Wine also questions. G, McKenna states that everything highlighted requires a septic system. G. McKenna refers C. Kolakowski and the Board to the narrative he has submitted regarding investment and other costs. G. McKenna states investment is the cost of the land. C. Kolakowski asks if \$35,000 was the cost of the land. G. McKenna states yes and explains that his partner had to purchase this lot along with the mobile home park. Initially they looked at options including expansion which cannot be done or doing lots but they were still back to the septic issue. A. Wine questions if they could put a recreational facility on the lot. D. Eskoff questions what reasonable return would they get from that? She asks the Board to review the potential uses and states they need to review each one. She reads through the list. G. McKenna states that while the lot is 6.23 acres the usable acreage is only about 3 acres. D. Eskoff states that it is very limited due to the wetlands. N. Toussaint states that when he walked the property at the site visit he felt the wetlands were quite a ways back due to the fill. G. McKenna states the wetlands should have been marked. They would have to install drainage basins and you cannot do that in wetlands because it eats up the space and then you have the setbacks. D. Eskoff states that the mobile home park has had some visual issues with clean up that were made more visible recently to the public that she feels may affect the value of this parcel as it is next to it. J. Szpak states that in the other case the Board had a realtor that said this is what I would do on this property and this is what it would return that is what the Board compared it against. D. Eskoff states that the Board is going through the list looking at the comparatives. C. Kolakowski states he is looking at uses on this list that require septic that may be reasonable. He is not at the point yet to say there is nothing on the list that may not be reasonable with a septic by competent financial analysis. We are saying what is a reasonable rate of return. Now there is a new owner. G. McKenna states that has not happened yet. C. Kolakowski agrees 100% that a 3,000 square foot house would not give a reasonable return. He states there is a listing sign out front does the Board know how long it has been listed. G. McKenna states that he thinks it has been there for two (2) years. C. Kolakowski asks what is the list price. G. McKenna states he believes it is \$80,000 but he is investing \$35,000. L. Sanda asks if the Board can review the number again. J. Szpak states he feels that the Board needs a professional to provide that information. G. McKenna states you could subdivide it but it does not negate the septic cost issue. Even if you put three (3) separate 1,000 square foot mobile homes you are still looking at three (3) septic systems. L. Sanda states if you filled just this septic system alone you are looking at 2,000 cubic yards of fill and that would be 7' coming down at a one on two and no one wants that in their yard. That would have to be blended out right now the whole front of that is on bedrock there would be no yard what so ever. There needs to be fill in there to grade it to make it presentable so it does not look like a pyramid with a septic. L. Sanda explains her calculations on fill. J. Szpak states that in a development behind his house a house just sold for 1.25 million dollars and it has a huge

hill right next to it it's built up about 4.5'. D. Eskoff states that it is in a different neighborhood and type of houses. J. Szpak states that his point is that someone who's willing to pay a million dollars has a septic system raised bed like that. L. Sanda states that she feels no one is going to put in a million dollar house here because no one is going to buy it. It would probably be a modular home or a smaller home to fit in the neighborhood. She can't imagine the septic would be much smaller than that. The Board would need numbers on the sale of a smaller modular. Right now it's shear bedrock. They are looking at an esthetic. G. McKenna states there isn't a view there either. J. Szpak states no and it's on bedrock. L. Sanda states that she does not think the bedrock is the main issue. D. Eskoff states the Board is looking for distinguishing characteristics of the property that set it apart from other properties within the District. Not just in the neighborhood, in the District too that makes it unique. If we don't consider it unique then we are not even on step one of a Use Variance. The bedrock does play into it or it would not be an issue. J. Szpak states that it is unique. L. Sanda states grading required is for esthetic landscaping purposes and for the necessary to construct a septic system is only 2,000 cubic yards but you just can't do that because no one will buy it. D. Eskoff asks what the base price is without a house on top of it? L. Sanda states that it could take up to \$137,000. C. Kolakowski states the Applicant should resubmit that information, it is not up to the ZBA to figure this out. D. Eskoff states the last Applicant before the ZBA for a Use Variance basically submitted the same type of information as submitted by this Applicant to do comparison. G. McKenna states the newest structure in the neighborhood was in 2002. D. Eskoff asks the Board that as a practical matter would someone be willing to purchase for a particular price and asks the Board to put themselves in the shoes of the person looking to buy the house and/or invest. G. McKenna states there is no way around the septic issue. A. Wine discusses potential recreational use. D. Eskoff does not think this is an ideal location for recreational use and L. Sanda states there are more appropriate recreational places in Town and that are free for residents. D. Eskoff states they could do it but would it be a reasonable return. The Board does not have a true comparison for housing if the last structure was built in 2002. C. Kolakowski states that the Applicant is showing the cost not necessarily the return. L. Sanda states that she feels the minimum base on her calculations of land and site work would be \$120,000 then the question becomes what kind of house will be put on that lot. A. Wine states if we are talking about an abstract future that they truly can't predict he would throw out the scenario that there may not be that many lots available in the Town 20-30 years from now so he might build on bedrock. D. Eskoff states that the Board needs to balance all of that. C. Kolakowski agrees what the ZBA members have said and feels they need to have something more realistic for the area. The Board discusses the needing the history, background of what happened with the seller, etc. G. McKenna states the property is for sale with his partner and is assessed for approximately \$45000 for 6.23 acres. He states that storage units are growing in popularity. D. Eskoff states that the Board has to look at this; it is an investment potential livelihood situation. N. Toussaint raises the issue of solar. G. McKenna states that solar is not practical won't be good return. D. Eskoff reminds the Board that buffering can mitigate some concerns if the Board so choses. C. Kolakowski raises public real estate listing information is needed. N. Toussaint asks about a perk test. G. McKenna states there will still be stormwater issues. D. Eskoff asks the Board what further information they require of the Applicant prior to the next ZBA meeting.

RESOLUTION: 355 Grange Road, LLC Case #994

MOTION: A. Wine

SECOND: L. Sanda

RESOLVED, the Zoning Board of Appeals hereby tables Case #994, 355 Grange Road, LLC, TM# 151.-2-58.1, pending receipt of the following information by May 22, 2018 to the Building Department/ZBA:

- Public real estate listing(s) history of the property
- Sale and listing information on other six (6) acre vacant lots in the Town of Greenfield

VOTES:

Ayes: D. Eskoff, C. Kolakowski, L. Sanda, J. Szpak, A. Wine

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m. All members in favor.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kimberley McMahon
ZBA Secretary