

## **TOWN OF GREENFIELD**

### **PLANNING BOARD**

**April 10, 2012**

#### **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, Lorna Dupouy, Thomas Siragusa, John Streit, Stan Weeks and John Bokus, Alternate. Nathan Duffney and Michael Gyarmathy are absent. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer, is present.

---

#### **MINUTES – March 27, 2012**

MOTION: L. Dupouy

SECOND: J. Bokus

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of March 27, 2012 as submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Dupouy, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak

Absent: Duffney, Gyarmathy

Noes: None

---

#### **BRIAN NIX – Site Plan Review**

Young Road

Brian Nix is present. T. Yasenchak opens a public hearing at 7:03 p.m. and asks the applicant to explain his project. B. Nix states that he and his wife purchased this property and would like to have some farm animals. They would like to have the chickens and turkeys now and maybe the other animals in the future. At the last meeting he was asked to look at another location for the manure pile. He indicates that they have moved it to the other side of the stream and there are trees between it and the road. New location is indicated on the site plan. T. Yasenchak asks for clarification of which barn is no longer on the property. B. Nix clarifies and indication is made on the plan. S. Lieberman, Environmental Commission, states that she still has concerns regarding the manure pile and that 75' is not far enough from the stream. B. Nix states that he had an environmental officer on the property and the officer was not aware of a specific distance requirement. S. Lieberman suggests that B. Nix contact Cornell Cooperative Extension. She states that J. Streit had stated at the last meeting that there is a concern about raising chickens and turkeys on the same property and Cornell would be able to help with that also. She asks if the applicant has a program for dealing with flies, as there will be a lot with the manure pile. She states that from an Environmental Commission standpoint, the applicant should try to make sure to not over populate the property with too many animals. There being no further public comments, this public hearing is closed at 7:08 p.m.

T. Yasenchak asks C. Baker if he knows of specific standards that DEC may have in place regarding manure piles. C. Baker states that he agrees that 75' seems too close to the stream and he knows that it would need to be 100' from a well. Since there is the potential for runoff, the manure pile should be as far away as possible. He states that this is a large parcel and that the applicant should try to get another 25'. T. Yasenchak suggests another location and states that it is farther away from the house and the neighbor. B. Nix states that it is actually closer to a neighbor because that home is approximately 75' from the property line. C. Baker asks about the topo. B. Nix states that the new location for the manure pile is a flat area but then it does slope toward the stream. L. Dupouy states that everything sounds good with the exception of the manure pile. J. Streit states that the most salient thing is where the applicant is going to put the pig is going

April 10, 2012

to affect more people than anything else. Other than that they should keep the turkeys downwind of the chickens. T. Siragusa states that he agrees with the comments about the manure pile. He questions that the list does not mention horses but the applicant stated that they do have one. B. Nix states that he was told that he didn't need to put that in the application as horses are allowed. T. Siragusa states that horses are not listed and he is just curious since we are discussing the manure pile, just everything that is going in there. He states that it doesn't seem like a lot of animals to him for some giant manure pile. If they are going to have 20 horses, that would be a lot different. B. Nix states that they will not have more than 4 horses. T. Siragusa states that the manure management is solvable. S. Weeks states that he feels that progress was made by moving the manure pile from the other side of the stream and that this is a pretty small number of animals. He is not aware of any specific distance requirements from wetlands. Regarding the pig, he states that most people will move a pig enclosure from time to time, as pigs are pretty destructive on the land. J. Bokus asks what the applicant intends to do with the manure. B. Nix states that this location is within 5' of the garden so it is easy access. J. Bokus agrees that the best thing might be to check with Cooperative Extension and perhaps a berm could be placed on the stream side of the pile. B. Nix questions if J. Bokus means something like a retaining wall and that the water could still leach through the ground under a wall. J. Bokus states that if the applicant is going to use it for his garden, it is not going to be there for long. S. Weeks states that Cooperative Extension would be a good resource for manure systems, but NRCS (National Resource Conservation Service) is really the organization that the applicant should talk to, as they would know the requirements, if there are some, in the State of New York for separation distance. He states that the applicant could also put a lean-to type roof over the manure pile and there are other things that can be done to have it in that location fairly easily. T. Yasenchak states that this application does not require SEQRA. She asks if the Board would like to ask the applicant to make those contacts and come back to the Board with the relevant information. She thinks it is a very good and reasonable request to address especially since it is close to a stream and a wetland. J. Streit states that he believes that the applicant has enough input from the Board and he has been given two resources. He thinks that he would trust the applicant to follow thru. T. Yasenchak states that this could also be approved with the contingency that he submit something to this Board. S. Weeks states that we could all learn something from that too.

#### **RESOLUTION – B. Nix, Site Plan Review**

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: L. Dupouy

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board approves the application of Brian Nix for a Site Plan Review for agricultural use for property located at 244 Young Road, TM#161.-1-17, contingent upon:

- **Applicant is to contact Cornell Cooperative Education and NRCS (National Resource Conservation Service) and to document and submit a management plan for the manure pile**

T. Yasenchak states that this would include how to manage the manure pile and the fly issue.

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Dupouy, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak

Absent: Duffney, Gyarmathy

Noes: None

---

#### **ZBA REFERRAL**

**L. O'Connor** - T. Yasenchak states that she will not recuse herself on this as it is a ZBA referral. Applicant is requesting subdividing 2 lots into 1 keyhole lot and two lots requiring variances. No Planning Board issues.

**S. James** – Applicant is seeking a variance to build a shed. No Planning Board issues.

April 10, 2012

**L. Farrar/P. Pileckas** – The applicants are seeking an area variance to install an inground pool. No Planning Board issues.

---

**LEIGH O'CONNOR – Minor Subdivision**

Locust Grove Road

Leigh O'Connor is present but not on the agenda. T. Yasenchak recuses herself as she works with the applicant on projects. J. Streit asks the applicant to explain the project. L. O'Connor states that when he purchased this property it was zoned for 3-acre lots and he purchased it for himself and his kids with the intention to subdivide it. He can now afford to build a new house and would like to subdivide the property into one 6-acre keyhole lot and two 2.45-acre lots, which would each require acreage variances. He states that he feels that it fits the property; that he tries to take care of his property and makes improvements. J. Streit asks about access to the rear. L. O'Connor states that he is creating a keyhole lot with 50' of frontage, even though 40' is required. He states that he uses this area now. There is a pond in the back and it is hidden by the trees. J. Streit asks if the structures depicted on the front are existing. L. O'Connor states that they are. S. Weeks asks if there are any comments from the Code Enforcement Officer. R. Rowland states that L. O'Connor was not on tonight's agenda so G. McKenna did not provide comments, other than those for the ZBA referral. R. Rowland thought that the applicant would not be coming to the Planning Board until after he has dealt with the ZBA. S. Weeks states that it is critical to get the Area Variances. J. Streit states that then the only new structure would be the new home on the back lot. L. O'Connor states that is correct, he plans to build a log cabin with a garage and it will conform with zoning. L. Dupouy asks for clarification that this will be 3 lots. L. O'Connor explains. J. Streit asks how long the applicant has lived here. L. O'Connor states about 10 years. J. Streit states that the applicant will have to get ZBA approval and then come back to the Planning Board with a map that indicates topo. C. Baker states that the applicant should review the subdivision regs for plot plan requirements. L. O'Connor states that he has checked zoning and he will be fine on setbacks, etc.

---

**DISCUSSION**

T. Siragusa asks if the Board has set any site walks. T. Yasenchak states that no dates have been set. Perhaps some of the major subdivision applicants will be back for the next meeting and we may be able to set a date since things have dried out somewhat. She also suggests the Board review the cluster regs.

---

Meeting adjourned, 7:32 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland  
Secretary