

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD

July 11, 2017

REGULAR MEETING

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by T. Yasenchak at 7:00 p.m. On roll call, the following members are present: Tonya Yasenchak, John Bokus, Nathan Duffney, Michael Gyarmathy, Thomas Siragusa, John Streit, Stan Weeks and Robert Roeckle, Alternate is absent. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer, is present.

MINUTES - May 9, 2017

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: J. Streit

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of May 9, 2017 as presented.

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak
Noes: None

MINUTES – June 13, 2017

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: J. Bokus

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of June 13, 2017 as presented.

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak
Noes: None

MINUTES – June 27, 2017

MOTION: S. Weeks

SECOND: J. Streit

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of June 27, 2017 as presented.

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak
Noes: None
Abstain: T. Siragusa

PLANNING BOARD CASE

MIKE AND ROSE MC BILES – Minor Subdivision

Spier Falls Road, Case#601

Mike McBiles is present and states that his lot is approximately 48 acres, he is moving, wants to sell the property with the exception of a small piece to keep for himself. S. Weeks states that this is pretty straight forward to him except that we would need to see a survey. T. Siragusa questions sight distance for the driveway. Discussion takes place regarding the wetlands. B. Duffney states that the septic and

well should be located on the map. C. Baker states that at least the edge of the wetland needs to be delineated. T. Yasenchak states that the additional information should be received by August 1, 2017 to be on the August 8, 2017 meeting. The applicant should check the Town's requirements for what needs to be on a survey map.

ED PARKER/HIGH PEAKS SOLAR – Special Use Permit

Route 9N, Case#600

Kevin Bailey is present for the application. T. Yasenchak states that an area variance is required for this application as the applicant only has .83 acres with 160' of road frontage, 3 acres with 200' of frontage is required. The variance needs to be done before the Planning Board can act. She refers to the information that is required for a solar installation including the setback lines. M. Gyarmathy questions the height of the panels, what they are made of and what color they will be. J. Streit questions the new laws that are being proposed that would not permit one to sell back into the grid. B. Duffney states that it appears that the setbacks would be fine and this is fine with him. S. Weeks questions that the applicant is aware of the new Town codes. T. Yasenchak reviews that the information required needs to be in the application in some form and reiterates that the applicant needs a variance. Question is asked why the residents were not notified. T. Yasenchak states that there was notification, it was an extensive process that the Town went thru, the information is on the website, etc. K. Bailey questions if there are differences in how roof mounted panels are reviewed. T. Yasenchak states that yes, it is different. If it is residential, roof mounted and follows the plane of the roof, one would not need a special use permit. A building permit would be required.

KEVIN BAILEY/HIGH PEAKS SOLAR – Special Use Permit

Sand Hill Road, Case#599

Kevin Bailey is present for the application. K. Bailey explains the project. T. Yasenchak reiterates that certain information is required for solar installations. We do have a survey for this property; however this will require a variance for the frontage. T. Yasenchak reviews the procedure for giving a referral to the ZBA.

SANDRA ARNOLD-SPAULDING – Minor Subdivision

Porter Corners Road, Case#603

Sandra Arnold-Spaulling explains that she would like to subdivide her property, sell her existing house, put a modular on one lot and keep the third lot vacant for the time being. B. Duffney questions the location of the property. S. Arnold-Spaulling explains. T. Siragusa states that the map looks really good, it is straight-forward; he questions the sight distance and asks about wetlands. S. Arnold-Spaulling states just the corner is wet. T. Yasenchak states that the driveways and sight distance should be on the maps. C. Baker asks about topos and they should be on the plans. Public hearing is discussed and will be set after new maps are received. Discussion takes place as to the proximity of this property to the Rod & Gun Club and notes are requested to be put on the map that this is within a certain distance of the club and that there are farms in the area which could cause noises and odors.

SARATOGA CONSTRUCTION – Site Plan Review

Hi Trek Drive, Case#597

Tim Monahan is present for the application. T. Yasenchak reviews that the applicant was asked for some additional information previously as this property is in the KROD zone. That information has been provided. T. Monahan reviews the information submitted in their letter of June 30, 2017. The house will be located at the lowest elevation of the property. J. Streit asks the length of the driveway. T. Monahan states approximately 450'. T. Yasenchak states that it appears to be 621' to the turn. J. Bokus comments on the pull-offs required for fire trucks. B. Duffney explains the pull-offs and the pole to be at the end of the driveway with reflective tape indicating the 500' increments. T. Yasenchak states that a turnaround is also required at the house location for fire trucks and that needs to be on the plans. T. Siragusa asks if the topo has been provided and asks about wetlands. Discussion takes place that the driveway is already in place. T. Yasenchak states that we can waive the public hearing on this. C. Baker states that the SEQRA is required. Board reviews at this time.

RESOLUTION – Saratoga Construction, SEQRA

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: T. Siragusa

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered and the second box is checked, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impacts for the Site Plan Review of Saratoga Construction for property located at 7 Hi Trek Drive, TM#149.-1-108.

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak
Noes: None

RESOLUTION – Saratoga Construction, Site Plan Review

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: M. Gyarmathy

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board approves the application of Saratoga Construction for Vicki and Jack O'Malley for a Site Plan Review for property located in the KROD and located at 7 Hi Trek Drive, TM# 149.-1-108 as presented and reviewed. Public hearing is waived. This approval is contingent upon:

- **The applicant adding notes for the driveway, the driveway turnarounds, the driveway marking for emergency vehicles and the pull off areas for emergency vehicles according to the Town's regulations**

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak
Noes: None

PATRICK PIPER – Minor Subdivision

Brigham Road, Case#589

Patrick Piper and Scott Masse are present for the application. T. Yasenchak reviews that we were waiting for the applicant to receive a variance. P. Piper states that they did receive the variance. Board has no additional questions. The application had been deemed complete. A public hearing is not required on this application as one was held by the ZBA. Board members in favor of waiving a public hearing.

RESOLUTION – P. Piper, SEQRA

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: J. Bokus

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 Patrick Piper for property located at 87 Brigham Road, TM#138.-2-9

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak
Noes: None

RESOLUTION – P. Piper, Minor Subdivision

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: T. Siragusa

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board approves the application of Patrick Piper for a Minor Subdivision of property located at 87 Brigham Road, TM# 138.-2-9, waiving a public hearing as one was held by the ZBA.

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak
Noes: None

RESOLUTION – P. Piper, Minor Subdivision – Approval Amendment

MOTION: T. Siragusa

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board amends the approval of the application of Patrick Piper for a Minor Subdivision of property located at 87 Brigham Road, TM# 138.-2-9, to add the following contingency:

- **Addition of notes for marking of the keyhole driveway per the requirements for emergency vehicles**

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak
Noes: None

LPC PROPERTIES, LLC – Minor Subdivision

Middle Grove Road, Case#597

Paul Pileckas is present for the application. T. Yasenchak states that G. McKenna’s notes state that no letter has been received from ACOE. P. Pileckas states that they were at the property in June and he believes that a letter was drafted. T. Yasenchak states that we will need a copy. She states that the Board had asked for the sight distances to be noted and the proposed driveways. C. Baker states that the test pits are shown on the plan, but there are no logs for them. As far as the sight distance goes, he believes there will be issues for lot 1 and lot 4. We need something from a licensed traffic engineer. There probably is a better location for the driveways. A public hearing is discussed and the additional information is needed by July 18th. At that time a public hearing may be able to be set for July 25th.

PRESTWICK CHASE – Revised PUD

Denton Road, Case#595

Fred McNeary and David Penkowski, Attorney, are present. T. Yasenchak states that additional information was received, as requested, at the last meeting. There were revisions to the plans. Information was received regarding the coverage and tables regarding acreage, etc. She states that her

concern is that the language talks about density and location based on the site, as amended, yet we don't have all the details. She has some reservations about approving a PUD based on the site plan when the site isn't approved yet. To her there are no boundaries. She discusses some kind of guidelines which she does not see here. Because this is still preliminary in nature, it is not a final site plan, it doesn't have all the drainage, exact house locations, but yet the PUD references based on this. D. Penkowski states that it references the approved map as amended. T. Yasenchak states that she feels it is kind of gray, not listing out parameters of defined square footage. She does not think that this preliminary map is detailed enough because it doesn't show specifically how close the houses will be to the property lines, sidewalks, etc. D. Penkowski states that the Planning Board could recommend approval to the Town Board. T. Yasenchak states that she does not feel that this is complete enough for her regarding density, aesthetic values, etc. She states that these are now single family and the visual impact to her is a lot more dense. She does not have the details on those homes, the types of houses, how they will interact, and how that will affect the character of the community. D. Penkowski comments that this is arbitrary. T. Yasenchak states that she does not think it is arbitrary because previously they had 3 specific buildings and we knew exactly where they were going and how those buildings were going to affect neighbors and view sheds, etc. Now we don't and that is why she does not think this is complete enough. We don't know if all of these houses are going to be 2400 square feet or some will be 1500. It is a big difference as far as density. She does not think that the PUD language is specific enough. T. Yasenchak states that the Planning Board does have the right to review SEQRA and unless given that additional information, she would not know how to proceed with SEQRA. She states that she believes that the Board did ask for some of this to be revised and not just the little units in the south east corner. C. Baker comments on the biggest change here being in the architecture and that is an issue. J. Streit states that he believes that D. Penkowski is saying that we are not approving each housing unit on the map, the language states that they can build up to 236 but if at final site plan approval we decide that 50 is the number, we are not limited by that language. T. Yasenchak states that she would feel comfortable in maybe the zoning language; it is not just the number of units but the total square footage of those units. This is something we asked from Saratoga Polo when we did a project with them. There was a cap on the total number. S. Weeks states that he sees this as a step forward compared to what we previously approved. It makes a lot more sense to him to have one and two stories. His biggest concern is in the narrative where they discuss building footprints which has now been revised to go anywhere from 1200 square feet to 2100 square feet. T. Yasenchak asks if he would like the square footage in the PUD language. S. Weeks states that would be helpful so that the Board would have an idea of the sizes being discussed. He states that the language stating that the building footprints will vary from 1200 +/- square feet to 2100 +/- square feet, that pins it down for him and makes him comfortable. T. Yasenchak states that if it is specified in the zoning, they would not have to come back for site plan for every single house. C. Baker states that the flexibility can come in where they can design it in phases, which would be one way for the application to move forward. S. Weeks states he was trying to pin the applicant down to get some idea of sizes as the drawing shows big pieces for 2-story houses. C. Baker asks if the applicant knows what the engineer was depicting for size. S. Weeks states the structures and not the area. M. Gyarmathy questions that we change the wording to say the footprint of the total structure will not exceed a certain amount. S. Weeks states that he was talking about the living square footage of the structure. C. Baker states that some of these issues can be dealt with in detailed site plan review. J. Streit states that if we were to look at this map, we are not approving the worst case scenario. We can get into the details at site plan. We are not approving that things will be built at this scale. T. Yasenchak states that we need parameters because then we know when they come back if it is very different. C. Baker states to the applicant that that is an important point, they should be aware that this is the worst case scenario and there could be the possibility that they can document that this will work. That remains to be proven. B. Duffney asks what C. Baker thinks the chances of that are. C. Baker states that he does not think they are very good. T. Yasenchak states that why she is hesitant is that she does not feel that the PUD language addresses the narrative description enough. The Town Board looks to the Planning Board to give them very specific direction and in the past even specific direction that we have given has not necessarily been followed, so we are kind of cautious. J. Streit asks

if the purpose of this session is that we accept this plan with the acknowledgement that this is the worst case scenario, send it to the Town Board for them to change the PUD language, inform them of what our concerns are and then it is up to the Town Board to carefully address, then when it comes back to the Planning Board we get down to the nitty gritty. T. Yasenchak states that once we deem an application complete, we have 35 days to render the decision in writing. D. Penkowski believes that they have a complete application and that the Board is dragging this out. S. Weeks states that initially in the narrative description the applicant talked about units with varying unit sizes ranging from 1200 to 1700 square feet of living space. It got revised to 1200 to 2100 square feet of building footprint. He feels that is a lot different, that is considerably different. M. Gyarmathy states that obviously we would feel more comfortable if we nailed this down. The applicant has heard the Board's concerns and M. Gyarmathy has not heard any suggestions on how to resolve the Board's immediate concerns tonight to move this forward. The Board members have said that they like the detail in the narrative and D. Penkowski, as an attorney, might be the one who can take some of the statements in the narrative and put it into the PUD to solve the Board's concerns. D. Penkowski feels that we are ahead of ourselves. C. Baker states that the Board is getting bogged down with details. The details will come later. The Planning Board needs to see a document of what they are going to ask the Town Board to approve as the applicant's amendment, which identifies the number of units, etc. T. Yasenchak states that the Board is asking for something in the PUD language that goes along with the narrative. D. Penkowski states that the best way to amend that is for the Planning Board to tell the Town Board what they want to see in the language. T. Yasenchak states that they are not giving the Planning Board that information. D. Penkowski states that the language is done at the Town Board not the Planning Board. If the Planning Board drafts something up the applicant can present it to the Town Board. Discussion takes place about the square footage of the living space vs the square footage of the building footprint. T. Siragusa states that listening to the different arguments; he thinks that having some kind of scope is important. This project is a huge difference compared to the rest of Greenfield but this is not a brand new PUD, it is a PUD Amendment. If he were on the Town Board he would want to know exactly what the difference is between the original and this amendment, a one page summary that spells out the differences. As far as the density is concerned, we are talking about footprints, impervious space, etc. and he would want to know all those things. He states that there are a number of things he likes better about this project, he likes that there are not the 3-story buildings and he thinks that some of the neighbors will be happier about that; he likes that there is still no development in the south east corner; he likes that there is still the emergency driveway out to Daniels Road. He thinks it is going in the right direction. Everyone agrees that the devil is in the details. He feels that if there is a 4200 square foot single home unit, he will have serious reservations on what this project really is and right now he is taking it as it is. It seems very unlikely to him with this project. If there is language that was agreed to before with the footprint up to 2100, he is ok with that. He feels that all these things – density, ranges, etc. – should be in the PUD. Time line is discussed. J. Streit states that we all seem to be saying that we are apprehensive about the size of the buildings. T. Yasenchak states that it keeps coming back to density. J. Streit states that what he thinks he is saying is that we need to have square footage ranges, maximum, and then we might be comfortable if we see that reflected in the PUD language. C. Baker states that the Town Board sent the Planning Board proposed revised language. The Planning Board needs to look at that revision and mark it up. We are getting bogged down in details. M. Gyarmathy asks if we do decide to deem this application complete, are we going to set aside time at the next couple of meetings where we can outline our recommendations for this project. T. Yasenchak states that we would be putting together a list of items that we feel should be changed in the PUD. She goes over the code language for deeming an application complete. C. Baker states that the documents have been provided. T. Yasenchak states that she is still not convinced about the information provided about the intensity and the density. M. Gyarmathy states that he would have to agree with other Board members that the applicant has given us all the necessary documents. He would feel comfortable that the application is complete. He would just ask the chair to set aside a certain amount of time at our next couple of meetings where we can hash this out.

RESOLUTION – PRESTWICK CHASE

MOTION: J. Bokus

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board deems the application of Prestwick Chase for an amendment to their PUD as complete for property located at 100 Saratoga Blvd, (Denton and Daniels Roads), TM#152.-1-109.1; TM# 152.-1-111 and TM# 152.-1-115.

Discussion – the attorney and the applicant have stated that the Planning Board can have the additional advisory opinion discussion extended to the last meeting in August, August 31st, which is the proposed date at this time.

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak
Noes: None

T. Yasenchak states that she will speak to the Town Attorney and asks that the Planning Board members come prepared with all of their comments in writing, how they feel about the advisory opinion and what each individual wants to see in that advisory opinion.

DISCUSSION

M. Gyarmathy states that he wants to remind everyone that it is not the Planning Board's job to advise or tell an applicant what to do with their projects. It is the applicant's responsibility to bring the correct information to the Board. The applicants should seek help to prepare their application if need be. If an applicant is not prepared, it is not the Board's fault that they did not read our language.

Meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m., all in favor.