

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD**

April 12, 2016

REGULAR MEETING

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

MINUTES – March 29, 2016

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: M. Gyarmathy

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of March 29, 2016, as submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Gyarmathy, Roeckle, Siragusa, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Bokus

Abstain: Streit

PLANNING BOARD CASE

SUE ROSENBERG – Subdivision, Preliminary

Squashville Road

Sue Rosenberg, Paul Sager and Sue Bencuya are present. S. Rosenberg states that they are here in a very informal sense and they may not end up with this property. She indicates that there are 5 or 6 acquaintances who would like to retire together and make a little tiny neighborhood of 4 or 5 houses. They have in mind a small barn with 2 horses at the most. T. Yasenchak questions that they are planning 2 driveways that are going to be shared. S. Rosenberg states that she has no idea, she just threw that in. They could make a horseshoe, etc. They are totally flexible about it. They are not renting out any land or trying to sell any land, it is just them. She states that P. Sager and S. Bencuya would probably buy the land, do the subdivision and sell the rest of the group little plots. They could even theoretically move the houses somewhere else. T. Yasenchak asks how many acres there are all together. S. Rosenberg states that it is 87.87 acres. T. Yasenchak states that this is in the MDR2 so it would be 3 acre building lots. S. Rosenberg states that their thought is that if the Town allows a conservation subdivision, they would be very interested in that. T. Yasenchak explains that it is the Planning Board's job to look at what is presented to us and give the applicant feedback. This is very conceptual in nature and she explains that there are standards and requirements for conservation subdivisions in our zoning code. The Planning Board does like conservation subdivisions, but does not suggest that route. The Planning Board is not here to design a project. She does state that they cannot have shared wells and septs, unless they are doing a duplex of some sort. She explains that the Board typically looks at shared driveways on a need basis if there are land constraints, because we have issues with shared driveways as years go on, and if the lots all have frontage on a road, which is important as we have requirements for frontage. P. Sager asks if there are some sort of guidelines. T. Yasenchak states that they should check the Zoning and subdivision Code. T. Siragusa states that he loves the idea, it is tricky because the Code is written for individual houses, it is written for perpetuity. There appears to be a lot of wetlands on this property, but there is a lot of buildable area also. S. Rosenberg comments on the dead end road to the east of this property. T. Yasenchak states that that type of

April 12, 2016

development is no longer allowed, unless there is a home owner's association. Board consensus is that this is an interesting concept and the challenge is finding a way to make it fit with the Town Code.

JOHN JORDAN – Minor Subdivision

Middle Grove Road

Laura Wilday, J. Jordan's daughter, and Richard Kline are present for the application. L. Wilday explains that they were asked to remove the septic measurements and to have the standard notes added to the plans. This is an 8 1/3 acre plot and they are looking to subdivide it into 3 parcels. They intend to build on the middle lot.

A public hearing is opened at 7:20 p.m. Erin Moller, Ashlor Drive, states that she does not know anything about the project but that her property backs up to this subdivision. L. Wilday explains approximately where they will be building their home and the septic location. E. Moller indicates that there are some wet areas on her property. T. Yasenchak explains that the subdivision as it is being presented does meet the Code and that the applicant is allowed to clear up to 1 acre without getting any special permits. If they wanted to clear more than that, they would be required to file with the DEC. Because one is generally only allowed to clear 1 acre, a limit of clearing is not requested on the plans. There being no further public comments, this public hearing is closed at 7:24 p.m.

RESOLUTION – J. Jordan, SEQRA

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: B. Duffney

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 Minor Subdivision of John Jordan for property located at 11 Hyspot Road, TM# 163.-2-55.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Gyarmathy, Roeckle, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Bokus

RESOLUTION – J. Jordan, Minor Subdivision

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: T. Siragusa

RESOLVED, that the Town of Greenfield Planning Board grants a minor subdivision for two additional building lots to John Jordan for property located at 11 Hyspot Road, TM#163.-2-55 per the map submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Gyarmathy, Roeckle, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Bokus

SKIDMORE COLLEGE – Site Plan Review

Van Patten House Cottage and Van Patten Carriage House

Dave Carr, the LA Group and Dan Rodecker, Skidmore College, are present. D. Carr explains that Skidmore purchased the Van Patten property on North Broadway, would like to convert both buildings into administrative offices and move more employees from the campus the same as they did with the Waring House. The cottage is approximately 5000 square feet and will house 11 employees with the garage being approximately 2000 square feet and housing 5 employees. There will be minimal site disturbance with

April 12, 2016

parking shared at the Surrey parking lot. They will be continuing the sidewalk up to the Carriage house and they will be removing approximately 10,000 square feet of impervious area with this project and converting it back to natural landscaping. The cobblestone circular driveway will remain as will the patio in the back. There is a large gravel driveway that circles between them that would be completely removed and landscaped.

A public hearing is opened at 7:44 p.m. J. Keyzer, North Creek Road, questions where the handicap parking will be. D. Carr points out where the existing handicap parking is located and per the NYS Building Code, they are not proposing any additional handicap parking. He indicates where they could put a couple of spots if the Board would like to do so, although they are not proposing any as this is a handicap accessible route. J. Keyzer questions lighting. D. Carr states that there is lighting on the buildings, they will not be occupied at night. There is also street lighting. J. Keyzer questions the distance one would have to walk from the handicap parking area. D. Carr states that it is approximately 400'. J. Keyzer states that he would have a concern with that and that the handicap parking should be as close as possible to the area as opposed to 400' away. T. Yasenchak states that the applicant also mentioned that there is public parking on the road as well. D. Rodecker explains that there is also handicap parking behind the Waring House. There being no further public comments, this public hearing is closed at 7:47 p.m.

D. Carr states that the applicant was requested to put in a sidewalk from the Waring House lot to the Van Patten lot, and they are adding that. The parking covenant has been submitted for review. D. Carr states that they did check the building code and Chapter 11 indicates "where parking is provided", which he thinks is the key, "accessible spaces should be supplied in a certain number per spaces." He states that the applicant is not opposed to putting in handicap spaces in the circular drive, 1 or 2, if the Board feels that is important. D. Carr states that he did speak to the City Planner today about this project and she seemed fine with it. S. Weeks states that adding the 2 parking spots is a good pro-active way to approach this. The remainder of the Board concurs. C. Baker questions that the garage building is sprinklered. D. Carr states that it is not. C. Baker states that his question would be the fire access. D. Carr points out that there is a 14' wide gravel access to the rear of the garage and they will be leaving that. The lighting is reviewed again. There are building lights and there are some pole lights in the circular driveway. T. Yasenchak questions that the Board would be comfortable moving forward with these applications with the contingency that the handicapped parking and gravel drive be reviewed and approved by C. Baker, along with the parking covenant being reviewed and approved by the Town Attorney. S. Weeks asks if we feel obligated to wait for the City of Saratoga Springs to give us a response. T. Yasenchak states that there would really be no effect to the City. D. Carr states that he spoke to Susan who was just asking for an explanation and said "ok". J. Streit states that he believes that Skidmore has had a high priority of proper lighting due to potential on campus incidents and he trusts Skidmore to properly light something in the best interest of the student body and the employees. D. Rodecker states that if they see an issue, they will definitely take action. SEQRA is discussed and not required as this is an unlisted action.

RESOLUTION – Skidmore College, Van Patten House Cottage, Case#553

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Town of Greenfield Planning Board grants site plan approval to Skidmore College for 954 North Broadway, TM#153.-2-14, the Van Patten House Cottage, contingent upon:

- **The parking covenant being reviewed and approved by the Town Attorney**
- **The two handicap parking spaces be added to the front of the cottage with the plans being revised and submitted to the Town for the Town Engineer to review and approve**
- **As part of this determination, the Planning Board waives the parking requirement for the cottage as there is shared parking with a covenant to be reviewed by Town Attorney which will be in place**

April 12, 2016

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

RESOLUTION – Skidmore College, Van Patten Carriage House, Case#552

MOTION: T. Siragusa

SECOND: S. Weeks

RESOLVED, that the Town of Greenfield Planning Board grants site plan approval to Skidmore College for 956 North Broadway, TM#153.-2-9.1, the Van Patten Carriage House, contingent upon:

- **Amendment to the site plan to depict the gravel driveway along the back of the building for fire safety subject to the review and approval by the Town Engineer**
- **Waiving the requirement for onsite parking with the inclusion of a parking covenant that would allow for shared parking on the Skidmore lands adjacent and that covenant be reviewed and approved by the Town of Greenfield Counsel**

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

JOHN KEYZER – Minor Subdivision

North Creek Road

John Keyzer is present. T. Yasenchak states that additional information was requested and submitted. J. Keyzer explains that he owns 65 acres and wishes to subdivide out 4 building lots at 3+ acres each for residential use, 2 are keyhole lots and 2 have road frontage. T. Yasenchak states that because of the curve of the highway, the sight distance was reviewed and these locations were approved by a professional engineer to show that they meet the NYS DOT requirements for safe ingress and egress.

A public hearing is opened at 8:09 p.m. Lorraine Desmond, North Creek Road, states that she is directly across from the proposed lots and questions how much of the woods would be lost. She is concerned with the visual impact and the curve. T. Yasenchak explains that the driveways were located as indicated due to the DOT requirements and so that additional clearing would not be required for sight distance. Clearing is limited to 1 acre per lot without notice. There are ways to clear more than one acre, but then you have to go through a different process. She explains that on the lot directly across from L. Desmond, the applicant would have to clear a great deal to get up L. Desmond's home. Mike Saxby, North Creek Road, questions where the proposed driveways are located. He asks what the proposed clearing will be on lot 4. T. Yasenchak reiterates her comments. M. Saxby questions that the one acre clearing is per lot. T. Yasenchak reiterates that we do not limit to less than one acre because by the time someone gets a house and a septic on there, they might be a little less than an acre, and they would need to clear for the driveway, etc. C. Baker explains that when someone applies for a building permit, they have to provide a plot plan that shows the actual location of the house, the septic system, the well, etc., and how much area will be cleared to build the house. Each lot will have to go thru that process. M. Saxby indicates that the intersection of Coy Road was moved because it was a dangerous intersection. For someone to come about and change the property and reestablish 4 lots with any egress to North Creek would be a detriment in that corner. B. Duffney states that is why the driveways are laid out the way they are, because of DOT regulations. J. Keyzer asks if the concern was that trees would or would not be taken down at that corner. M. Saxby states that he would like to see no trees taken down. J. Keyzer states that during the process of getting those driveways located within the code, one of the options was to clear trees off of that corner and he decided not to do that. M. Saxby thanks J. Keyzer for that. J. Keyzer states that cutting the trees would make it a much safer corner. T. Yasenchak states that we have in the past denied applications because of sight distance. This is J. Keyzer's second or third iteration because of moving the driveway locations. The sight distance has been established

April 12, 2016

by a licensed engineer, reviewed and certified. Our Town Engineer also reviews that to make sure that it was done in compliance. C. Baker states that to speak on J. Keyzer's point too, they could increase the sight distance even more if they cut some of the tress along that curve. It was demonstrated that they did not need to do that based on the measurements that they provided. T. Yasenchak states that to J. Keyzer's question, he did not want to remove those trees as he wants to try to keep it as forested as possible. M. Saxby states that they appreciate the trees. There being no further public comments, this public hearing is closed at 8:19 p.m.

T. Yasenchak states that we did ask for some additional information at our last meeting. One being that since this is one larger lot of over 65 acres, we needed to see the remaining lot because there is an existing house on this property. Because that is part of the subdivision, we ask that that be part of the application. We received a small plan of that, which is good. We will need to see that larger one on the full map and not just this. It can be on another page of some sort, but we need to see that remaining lot as part of the documents. C. Baker states that the map that will be filed with the County Clerk's office is going to have to show the whole total area of land with all the lots in the subdivision including the one that is already existing. T. Yasenchak states that the Planning Board had also asked to have the surveyor note about what is shown as a stream at the corner of lot 3. J. Keyzer states that we should have an internal memo from the Building Inspector. R. Rowland states that there is no memo, but there are photos taken by G. McKenna. J. Keyzer states that G. McKenna did an inspection of that area. T. Yasenchak states that she does not believe that G. McKenna can do that. J. Keyzer states that there is nothing there. T. Yasenchak states that G. McKenna isn't a licensed professional that can do work for an applicant. If the surveyor noted something on the plans, then the surveyor needs to remove it and tell the Planning Board why, if it was an error or why it is being taken off. It cannot be the building inspector. J. Keyzer states that it will be taken off, it is not a creek, and it is just drainage. T. Yasenchak states that the line came from somewhere so typically what a surveyor will do to do the topography on the site, is to take the information from maps that are on line – USGS maps – often they will use that information so that they don't have to go out and shoot the topography of the whole lot. That is an acceptable practice for lots of this nature, but when he took that information and put it on his map, it shows a stream. Because of that we need the surveyor, because his name and stamp will be on this, to show it accurately. If there is not a stream, then he needs to take it off and tell us why it is not there. If he showed it there originally, it is there for a reason. Sometimes a stream is shown even if they don't run full time every day of the year. J. Keyzer questions another line. T. Yasenchak states that that is at the location of a culvert. C. Baker states that he would put it back to the surveyor. It is his responsibility to provide the Planning Board with information that says that he has researched the NYS DEC wetlands maps and that there is no indication that there are existing wetlands in that area. Someone has to go out and delineate it and verify that there are no wetlands in that area. That would be the only information that we can accept in order to say that there are no wetlands in that area. T. Yasenchak concurs. S. Weeks asks where it is identified that the line symbolizes a stream. He does not find it on the map. T. Yasenchak states that that is a standard – when you see the topography going in that direction, and you see that line, that is a standard practice meaning that it is some kind of stream. J. Keyzer questions that there is a note on the plans stating that there are no wetlands on the property. S. Weeks states that if it is not identified, he does not know what that line is. C. Baker states that in the key map there are wetlands denoted. He states that one possible option, if the applicant is willing to consider it, is to show a no build line around the corner showing that the applicant agrees that there will be no disturbance beyond that line. J. Streit states that he believes that it would be in the applicant's best interest to have it removed. SEQRA is discussed and the Board will wait for the findings on this area. J. Keyzer indicates that there is reluctance on the part of the surveyor to verify the entire property as he has not surveyed it. T. Yasenchak states that we need to have the meets and bounds to have this filed with the County including the lot that is remaining. J. Keyzer questions how to go about requesting a speed limit reduction. The process is explained. C. Baker states that he believes that a request was made at the time that the Coy Road intersection was reconfigured.

April 12, 2016

DISCUSSION

T. Yasenchak comments that the Planning Board has received the Zoning Board's minutes and suggests reading those pertaining to D. Evans, whose application has been referred to the Town Board for review for an open development approval.

Meeting adjourned 8:39 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary

DRAFT