

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

**April 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 also absent. Joe Sabanos has full voting privileges for the entirety of the meeting. M. Waldron, Zoning Administrator/Code Enforcement Officer is absent.

**Minutes**

December 29, 2020

MOTION: J. Sabanos  
 SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, The Planning Board waives the reading of, and accepts the December 29, 2020 Minutes.

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

**OLD BUSINESS**

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

370 Middle Grove Road  
 SUP/SPR

Zach Bouchard, Mike Scuola, and Chris Koenig are present. Chris Koenig states that this project is community solar arrays. The land is somewhat cleared. They have been working with National Grid. This will allow them to take the energy and distribute it to residents, renters, and small businesses. Z. Bouchard states this project will be using 18.34 acres of 122 acres that Mr. Eichorst owns. In order for us to meet zoning we must be fewer than 15% total average. Originally they were going to go in front of the ZBA for an Area Variance for more total averages. They have since decreased the total averages. They are at 14.99% total average. The panels will be 3.78' megawatts and all the panels will be 12' above ground and surrounded by a 7' chain link locked fence with no lighting. The electrical lines will be under ground. There will be a temporary construction staging area located at the Northeast corner of the site, along Middle Grove Road. M. Fingar states that this project could power between 400-700 homes. That is how much it is designed for. C. Koenig states that the sight is comprised of 2 parcels

163.-2-90 & 91. The existing survey is TM #163.-2-90 western side of the parcel and TM# 163.-2-91 is on the eastern side of the parcel. They will be asking for a Lot Line Adjustment or combined the properties. They have contacted DEC and had them delineate any wetlands. None of their proposed work will be in the wetlands. The turn-around for the driveway will be 12' wide and there will be 3 of them. C. Koenig states that they will not be required SPEEDS and no requirements for a SWPPP. They went over the zoning metric the project size is 20 acres, level 3 ground mount solar system. The lot itself is 122 acres and it has 2,000' of frontage. Including everything inside the fencing is 14.99% and the max is 15%. The panels are at 12' high and will tilt to the South. They are requesting the Planning Board Members to accept the application as complete for a type 3 Planning Board submittal. R. Roeckle asks if the proposed driveway is existing. C. Koenig states no. M. Fingar states not formally. R. Roeckle asks if there was going to be landscaping in the front. M. Fingar states correct. R. Roeckle states that he would like to see them in the setbacks. M. Fingar states they feel it is the best spot to put them, but they are open for requests. R. Roeckle asks is there a reason why the fence cuts in and the roadway goes wide. The roadway needs to keep under 15% total grade. Why don't they put a gate closer so people don't drive down the road? M. Gyarmathy asks about the glare. M. Gyarmathy states he would like revised drawings to meet their feedback. C. Dake asks if they have spoken to the neighbors. M. Fingar states he has not. C. Dake states no screening would be too much and what kind of species. T. Yasenchak states yes, and some kind of maintenance plan on if the tree dies and needs to be replaced. Another one will replace it Z. Lissard states that in their operation of maintenance if one tree dies another one will replace it as needed. J. Sabanos states that he feels that screening is going to be a huge hurdle for them. The applicants are taking away a beautiful hill with this project. M. Fingar states this project is a 25 year lease with 3 5 year extensions. J. Sabanos asks if the decommissioning and escrow accounts are in place. What happens in 25-30 years and the owner is longer with us what will happen if it looks like a junk yard. M. Fingar states that they factor that in. M. Gyarmathy asks if they have photos of other projects that can be provided to the Board. M. Fingar states yes, the closest project is on Clifton Park and they are working on the screening. M. Fingar states he would be happy to facilitate a site visit if the Board wishes. J. Sabanos asks if there is anyway the applicant can move the project slightly down on the hill to help with screening. C. Koenig states there is an advantage for them to put it on the hill. T. Yasenchak agrees with the Board about the screening and would like to see more screening along the road. She would like 8'-10' trees or higher and different species as well. The Board also requires the anti-glare FAA certification so they would like that. M. Fingar states that they have a letter from the T. Yasenchak ask's about the decommissioning plan. M. Fingar states that there are numerous recycling coming into play and they revisit them every 5 years. T. Yasenchak asks if the property owner will have to take over the decommissioning of the panels. M. Fingar states that he will make sure it is provided and clarified. C. Dake asks if there are any examples of hat a site would look like in 40 years. M. Fingar states he does not. Z. Lissard states that the decommissioning costs are high but they suspect that they will come down. M. Fingar states that they are looking for comments and feedback from the Town Engineer. T. Yasenchak asks if this property is part of an agriculture district. C. Koenig states it is in agriculture district. T. Yasenchak states that the Planning Board has nothing to do with agriculture an exemption that is with Assessor's office and they should make the owner aware of that. M. Fingar asks if the Board can deem their application complete. T. Yasenchak states The Board can't. Baker states that he will not have a report to them until at least 2 Weeks after the meeting. He is going on vacation and won't be back until April 28, 2021. So it won't have a report to them until at least the first week in May. T. Yasenhak states if the Applicants have everything to the Board one week before the public hearing. C. Baker states that he feels that the Board has a lot of projects going on in Town and they should have everything the Board is asking for at least 2 weeks so that the public has an opportunity to review the application. M.

Gyarmathy states that he feels that the Board should wait to set a public hearing until the Board has everything regarding the screening and the glaring. It should be in office for at least 1 week before the public hearing. The Board agrees. C. Koenig asks if the Board will set a public hearing for the first meeting in May. M. Gyarmathy states that that may not be realistic and the Board has to do their best. M. Fingar asks if the Board is familiar with Community Solar. T. Yasenchak states that they did one year ago before they adopted the code.

## DISCUSSION

T. Yasenchak states that the Board has to do continuing education and usually go to the County Planning and Zoning Conference and due to COVID-19 they are not doing the conference in this year. The Planning Board can ask the Town Board to waive the credits or they can watch something after a meeting. The staff does not have to stay. R. Roeckle asks if we are members of the Planning Federation and if they are they could take some classes they offer and it won't cost the Town anything. T. Yasenchak states that they have to get the Zoning Committee formed again. M. Gyarmathy asks don't we have to check with the Supervisor regarding this. T. Yasenchak states yes and she will do that. J. Sabanos states we should be going digital. The Board agrees to watch something after some meetings. C. Baker agrees, but we should have paper copies as well.

---

Peerless Grove, LLC Case #649  
TM# 125.-2-40 & 40.21

535 & 540 Locust Grove Road  
Major Subdivision

T. Yasenchak recuses herself from this project. R. Roeckle states that his sister works for CLA Site, but he feels that he can be impartial. Bill Teeter states that he is partners with Mike Scuola. He is still looking forward to doing this project. This is a proposed 6 lot major subdivision with no variances. They want to this property green. Peter Loyola states that they walked the property with Justin Burwell the Town Highway Superintendent and Mark Young the Deputy Highway Superintendent. They are looking to do 3 lots and 2 lots that will be equine lots and a keyhole lot with a 60' right of way. So there will be 5 building lots and 1 lot with the existing home. They will need to clear the trees in order to get sight distance. It is 45 m.p.h. on Locust Grove Road. J. Burwell did remove some trees at the property line. The vegetation has matured there. C. Baker states that he would like a report from a Traffic Engineer for the sight distance. J. Burwell is not a Professional Engineer. The Board needs to make sure that the Town is protected. M. Gyarmathy asks what lots have issues. P. Loyola states lot 3. Lot 1 there will be no tree removal. Lot 2 will have tree removal. Lot 1a no tree removal. Lot 3 there will be tree removal and also removal of a retaining wall for more than 360'. The other 2 he feels are addressed. C. Baker asks if they are using intersection sight distance might not be enough for 45 mph and states that maybe their biggest hurdle. R. Roeckle states maybe a caution sign for 35 m.p.h. P. Loyola agrees with C. Baker and states it might be their biggest issue. P. Loyola states that they prepared the short form SEQRA. C. Baker states that they will need a long form SEQRA. C. Dake states that this may be one too many keyhole lots. P. Loyola states that he knows that the Town does not like keyhole lots and shared driveways. His thought is they are creating more lots with the keyhole lot. They are prepared to do pull-offs for emergency services. C. Dake states that they might look like 4 lots instead of 5 or 6 lots and that needs to be treated as such, the big equine lot that might meet the most resistance. M. Scuola states they are trying to keep Greenfield green. P. Loyola states they are open up to a possible subdivision. R. Roeckle states that is M. Waldron's call. P. Loyola states that they will look at the best location for the homes. They have spent a lot of time planning out where the homes are going to go. The deeds do show increased setbacks. C. Baker asks if the

driveways are 40' wide. P. Loyola states yes. C. Dake states that if they keep 6 lots he would like to see where the houses would be and the sight distance. R. Roeckle asks where the septic is going on lot 6. What is lots 1A and 1B? P. Loyol states they are all 1 lot. They have them as lot 1A and 1B to show that they are all 1 lot. C. Baker states that the total disturbance that will determine if a SWPPP is needed. P. Loyola states that the soil is good there so he suspects they will have conventional septic systems. R. Roeckle states that the Board will need to see the Town Engineers review, long form SEQRA, and the traffic engineers report. C. Baker states that he won't have his report for everyone until at least by the next meeting.

---

Meeting adjourned at 8:34 p.m. All members in favor.

---

Respectfully submitted by,

Kimberley McMahon  
Planning Board  
Administrative Assistant.

