

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD**

**PLANNING BOARD**

**April 29, 2014**

**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: Nathan Duffney, Michael Gyarmathy, Andrew McKnight, Thomas Siragusa, John Streit, Tonya Yasenchak and John Bokus, Alternate. Stan Weeks is absent. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer and Mike Hill, Town Attorney, are present.

---

**MINUTES – April 8, 2014**

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: J. Bokus

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of April 8, 2014, with minor corrections.

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, McKnight, Siragusa, Streit,

Noes: None

Absent: Weeks

Abstain: Gyarmathy, Yasenchak

---

**ROBERT BACIGALUPO – Special Use Permit/Site Plan Review**

NYS Route 9N

R. Bacigalupo is present and explains that he has been operating his business at this location since 2006; no complaints, at all, until recently and only after a personal disagreement; in 2007 the Town Code changed to allow small contractor's storage yards in the LDR zone with 6 acres and 250'; this property is 6.81 acres and 315' of road frontage. No permits were required to operate a small contractor's storage yard in this zone. Since then, his business has grown and now he is seeking a special use permit to operate a large contractor's storage yard. Since being contacted by G. McKenna, the applicant has met with him and completed all requirements to date. He states that he would like to ask his brother-in-law to complete the presentation for him. Adam Dingmon reviews that B. Bacigalupo has been running the business on the back side of the property since 2006, he has grown and expanded. It was brought to his attention that he had to get a large contractor's storage permit, special use permit, and that is why he is here. A. Dingmon posts a site plan, distributes photos and reviews the map. He states that for the large contractor's storage yard an applicant can have no more than 8 vehicles with a gross weight of over 26,000 pounds. He opened the doors of the trucks and read what it said and he believes that's what it means –one at 82,740; one at 66,000; two at 59,200; and an F550 at 17,950. He owns another truck and Explorer. He explains the layout of the property and that it has trees on all sides, except for the entrance into the driveway. He explains how the driveway traverses the property. The trucks are backed into the garage at night when they come back; it minimizes the backup alarms when they pull out in the morning. The applicant has a 2 year old daughter and his wife is expecting in July, so he tries to minimize the noise. A. Dingmon explains that there are large cement, portable, storage areas for mulch. There is an island in the middle of the property with a clump of trees. He states that currently there is a bunch of (wood stove) pellets on the property. Every year a group of family and friends buy pellets directly from a distributor. As they make room in their garages, etc., the pellets get distributed to those homes. A.

April 29, 2014

Dingmon states that there were concerns brought to his attention by the neighbor, Clarence Covell, and he is going to address some of those concerns. Noise – this is Route 9N, it is busy, and it is a major thoroughfare. You will always have the noise, the traffic, fumes from the vehicles. Looking from the front of the property, you will not know that B. Bacigalupo owns a business, unless you go into the property. The noise is very minimal. There are times that he has started up the vehicles early and returned late, that is the nature of the business, but he also does plowing. When you have a bad snow storm, you have to get up to get to some of the commercial clients. Fumes – diesel vehicles have to start up, three of the four vehicles have a built-in shut off that if they idle too long will shut off. He reiterates that the property is over 6 acres, there are a lot of trees that provide a buffer so the fumes are very minimal. There is also all the traffic from 9N and an adjoining property that has other vehicles as well. To pin point it to one location would be extremely difficult. Vibration is one of the concerns. From the way the driveway goes in and where the garage is, there are several hundred feet of first grass then woods before you get to C. Covell's house. A. Dingmon states that he is at the property quite often and never experienced any vibrations inside the house or on the patio, so he was a little confused about that. There was a concern about headlights. A. Dingmon explains how vehicles would turn into the driveway and proceed thru the property. Coming from the north and pulling into the driveway, he states that the applicant's house is in direct line of C. Covell's house, which is pretty far in the back. The lights won't hit C. Covell's house. As you go by the applicant's house, the way the driveway is configured there is another garage. Coming from the southbound, it is the same principle, with the applicant's house right there and it is a 2-story house, so it deflects a lot of it. He states that there are lights that are located on the back garage, they are motion sensed, and there is one light post which B. Bacigalupo is going to take a look at for visibility and if need be, will make changes to direct that light the best he can. Traffic – Route 9N is always congested. He discusses the traffic patterns in the area. Zoning – as far as meeting the requirements for a large yard, the applicant does fall under the parameters. Harmony – as someone who has had difficulty with neighbors, A. Dingmon states that he understands wanting harmony with your neighbors and a good living situation for all. B. Bacigalupo is willing to put up more trees along the property line, evergreens. He explains that in looking at the pictures, right behind the swing set, there is a pretty good cut in there. They used to, back in the friendly days, work together a lot and cut thru each other's property, the applicant would bring his equipment over and help each other out. That area would be beefed up a little more to provide some more buffer. The evergreens will help out because they are lower and more bushy, so maybe for the sight level they will eliminate the little bit of noise that there may be. Then maybe the applicant can have a little harmony also, because it is a little unsettling thinking that your livelihood is in jeopardy and knowing that, especially with the paperwork that was submitted, that your neighbor is taking photographs of you, videotaping you and logging everything that you do. That would be uneasy for any of us in that situation. T. Siragusa asks where the neighbor's house is located on the map. A. Dingmon points it out. C. Covell states that he is 500' off the road. A. Dingmon reiterates that the entire property is surrounded by a wood line and C. Covell's house is behind any of B. Bacigalupo's structures. T. Yasenchak asks if all the trucks are parked in the back garage. A. Dingmon states that the two semi-trailers are in the far back garage, on the left side there is a garage that will fit the two tri-axle dump trucks and they are photographed with the garages and how they sit in the garage. He reiterates that the vehicles are backed in, and like any vehicle there is going to be noise, but he tries to minimize the noise the best he can both for his neighbors, his 2 year old and his wife. T. Yasenchak asks if there are employees that are coming to the site, parking and taking trucks. B. Bacigalupo states that he has 2 full time employees, his father-in-law, B. Schallen, helps out on a part time basis, and if someone is on vacation, he has another part time guy who comes in. T. Yasenchak asks if the employees come in, take a truck and go out, or are they there during the day. B. Bacigalupo states that the 2 tractor trailer drivers take the trucks and leave in the morning, his father-in-law delivers mulch. T. Yasenchak asks if the tractor trailers are being filled at this property or going and getting filled at a supplier. B. Bacigalupo states that they are going out and getting filled, sometimes they grab mulch on the way home from Albany and the drop it off. A. Dingmon states that vehicles are not coming and going thru out the day,

April 29, 2014

except for B. Schallen. T. Siragusa asks if wood chips are part of the business or just there for the property. A. Dingmon states that there is a big pile to the right side of the garage. T. Siragusa asks if people come in to pick it up or is it delivered. B. Bacigalupo states that it is almost always delivered but he has a couple of friends who would come to get it. T. Siragusa states that then there is some coming and going, but not on a consumer basis. B. Bacigalupo concurs. T. Yasenchak asks if they are doing any chipping on the site. B. Bacigalupo states that if a tree falls, then he does clean it up. T. Yasenchak asks if he is bringing trees to the site and chipping them. A. Dingmon states that they are not, if they bring down a tree they will chop it up on site. T. Siragusa asks if there are other trucks, he is reading comments about "cherry pickers", because he does not see those on the list. B. Bacigalupo states that he does not own any cherry pickers, he has a log trailer. T. Siragusa states that the weights on the application are different. A. Dingmon states that he read in the code description that they could have up to 8 vehicles propelled by their own power at 26,000, he does not know what the 26,000 lbs was, all he did was open the truck doors and read from the sticker weights. The 4 large vehicles that he has still keeps him under the 8 that are allowed.

A public hearing is opened at 7:26 p.m. Sarah Foulke, attorney for Sharee and Clarence Covell, states that she knew the Board had a copy of her letter and it appears that the applicant also has a copy. They play a recording and state that is what the neighbor hears from their porch at 6:00 at night and it does not at all represent the other noises that come from the yard next door – slamming back doors of trucks, etc. She states that there is wood chipping going on on the property. There was a large tub grinder that was sorting dirt and stone for quite a number of days or weeks last summer. The diesel is in fact hanging very low in the atmosphere and making it impossible for the Covell's to open their windows, so they are spending their summers with their windows shut. She provides some pictures that were provided by the Covell's that will show how wooded the property was in 2006 looking from their house towards the neighboring property and what they now see from their front yard. It has been cleaned out, completely cleared out and wood chipped into a large pile. She states that there is really no buffer at all between the two pieces of property. She indicates the pallets that were discussed and that it looks very much like a retail operation. She states that there are minutes taken by her clients over a week, only in the morning and the evening because they work, but what they are hearing of the trucks coming and going. She states that the day that she went up there to try to get an idea of what was going on, she followed an 18 wheeler into the property. It was 10:00 in the morning, a Pepsi truck; it said it was a Pepsi truck anyway. Neither of the Covell's wants to create a problem with their neighbor, that is not the goal. They did have a nice relationship and the problem has been that the development of this property has been occurring increasingly over a period of years and when they have asked for some sort of mitigation, they are not getting any response. So things have gotten more and more difficult, so this is a wonderful opportunity for the Board to assist in resolving the problem. Her clients don't want to put B. Bacigalupo out of business, that is not their goal. They want to come up with a way that the two of them can live together, but the reality that the Board has to deal with is that this is not a low density residential use and it is certainly not a "small contractor's side yard". There is too much happening there. She states that she drove there and saw that. She explains how the Covell's house is situated and they now have full view of everything happening here. In order for that to go away, there would have to be a huge thick buffer put in. It is possible that that would fix this. There needs to be thick, low undergrowth and that may also assist with the smell. The lighting needs to be changed so that it is not lighting up their living room. She does not believe that the applicant's garage is in the location indicated on the plans and it is not clear that it is situated 100' from the property line. S. Foulke states that the other issue that came up was the storage of diesel fuel on the property. She states that the goal is not to stalk, it is not to eavesdrop, the goal is not to cause problems, the goal is to somehow resolve a problem that has been growing and growing for several years, and despite many applications and trips to Town Hall by C. Covell, there has been no forum up until this point to address the situation. She understands wanting to grow your business, but if you are going to grow it in a zone that is not zoned for that use, you really need to be taking into consideration what you are doing to your neighbors. These people have a right to enjoy their

April 29, 2014

home. Their goal is really that and nothing else. Mathew Juk, Route 9N, states that he and his family live on the property just south of B. Bacigalupo and directly adjacent to it. He states that his wife, Rebecca Chandler, could not be present and asked him to read a letter on her behalf. He reads that as a life-long resident of the Town of Greenfield she has been disheartened with the latest round of complaints against people who operate businesses out of their homes. The goal of any business is to grow their company and to prosper in their endeavors. The goal and role of being a good neighbor is to support each other in these endeavors. She and her family have never had an issue with Mr. Bacigalupo and have no problem whatsoever with anything that he has done on his property. R. Chandler's uncle originally owned this property and she was so glad to see it go to a young family, see them take ownership after her uncle passed away. B. Bacigalupo and his wife have made so many improvements and have made the property absolutely beautiful. Obviously they are able to do so by growing and expanding their business. From what R. Chandler has seen of the applicant, he has made many contributions to the community and surrounding communities. He seems very willing to help anyone who comes to him with a need, whether he gets paid for it or not, or it is a donation on his part. She feels that the complaints are unfounded and perhaps based on spite. M. Juk states that he echoes his wife's comments and totally agrees. He states that as we watch our community succeed, part of that is having to watch our neighbors succeed. To him the sound of work is a pleasant sound; it has never bothered him once. B. Bacigalupo is not loud, he lives right next door and the shed that is supposedly full of diesel fuel and stinking up the area, he could hit that with a baseball outside the backdoor of his house and he has never smelled anything. He can see the shed, it is no problem to him whatsoever and he has never smelled any sort of exhaust or anything. There is a little bit of noise, but it has never bothered him. Clarence Covell, states that he has been at this location for 26 years, he has never had a complaint until last year and what happened was that B. Bacigalupo started clearing out everything, he built a 3 bay garage, he built a pole barn and a commercial garage in the back. He has numerous trailers that he stored there until about 2 months ago. He states that he has been complaining to G. McKenna for almost a year on this and finally, he spoke to Paul Lunde last month and he had G. McKenna send B. Bacigalupo a letter which told the applicant he had to come to the Planning Board. The mulch pits, they start about 5:00 in the morning loading them. He thinks it was the 19<sup>th</sup> of April that they had 10 tractor trailers deliver mulch. He has noted this. He invites the Board to come to his home to see exactly what they are dealing with. He looks out the front door and sees the applicant's commercial garage. When the applicant comes out of the three bay garage, the headlights shine into the Covell's bedroom window. When the applicant comes out of the commercial garage he shines the lights into the living room. They have never had a complaint, they have lived there peacefully and quietly for 25 years and only in the last year has it become so bad. They don't have a problem with diesel smell; they have a problem with diesel exhaust. They can no longer keep their windows open. The lighting is so bad at night that it lights up their back yard. Also, the noise is unreal – there are tailgates slamming, trucks coming, loading and unloading the trailers and it has been getting progressively worse. Mark Powers, Ballston Spa, states that he is a friend of C. Covell and has been out to the house many times, spent nights, etc. When he first came to the property it was very quiet and he didn't know that there were neighbors. He states that he has never met the applicant and has never heard C. Covell say anything bad about him. C. Covell had expressed to him how impressed he was with this young guy. This past year he has been to the property and observed the noise, etc., himself. This evening at dinner he could see directly into the applicant's yard. Jamie Young, friend of C. Covell, states that at first it was really hard to tell that the Covell's had a neighbor, you couldn't see any buildings or anything on the property, it was totally wooded and nice and peaceful. As of recently, it is just about clear cut, you can see everything in the neighbor's yard and the noise is quite distracting. Cathy Chandler, states that she has lived in Greenfield for 35 years and is the backdoor neighbor of the applicant, she states that she has never heard trucks at 5:30 a.m. and she is up at 5:00. Ruth Grono, Route 9N, states that she has had nothing but good things with B. Bacigalupo. Her husband has a snow blower and they have been doing their driveway which is quite long, but this winter they had a terrible time with all the snow and B. Bacigalupo saw J. Grono struggling one day and went down and did the whole driveway. Never charged a cent, never asked for anything and she offered to do some printing for him and he has not taken them up

April 29, 2014

on that. When you drive by his house, it is absolutely beautiful. From the outside looking in, it always looks neat. She does not see a lot of trucks there. If you do have a business, you are going to have a certain amount of trucks; if that is the business you are in. She finds nothing wrong with B. Bacigalupo and his family, they are great people. Kevin Chandler, states that he lives behind Cathy Chandler and behind B. Bacigalupo, he does not hear anything from his house either. He does know that since B. Bacigalupo took over the property from his uncle, he has cleaned the place up quite a bit. He states that he hears all this talk about the clearing, etc. He asks what the neighbor's lot looked like in 2006, where is the line, where are the trees. There are pictures, but where is the boundary line. Are the trees on the applicant's property or on the neighbor's property? Who did the clearing to the limit that you can see thru everything right now? He knows that the applicant cleared to put the building up, but whose property is mostly cleared is the question he asks. As far as any issues, B. Bacigalupo has been supportive in the community. K. Chandler states that the applicant is a young man trying to do a business in Greenfield and he thinks that we should be proud of that and encourage him to grow his business. We need business in Greenfield, small businesses and growth. Jonathan Davis, Chandler Lane, states that he also borders B. Bacigalupo's property in a sense. He also owns his own business and two months ago he was here fighting with the neighbors about noise, etc. with the Town Board. He states that he started out working 24 hours a day. Now the applicant has three employees and is making a living for his family. He states that C. Covell is his cousin, and B. Bacigalupo and his wife would have parties every year and the Covell's were there and it was a great time. Five years ago, it wasn't woods. The back parking lot was there and it was thinned out, but this all started a year ago and he thinks it is a personal vendetta to B. Bacigalupo. He thinks that the Town should be supportive of the applicant's future and the growth of his business. C. Covell states that when B. Bacigalupo was starting out this business, he and his wife went to all the meetings to support B. Bacigalupo. They are not anti-business at all. It was only in the last year when the applicant started to build. He states that their lives have gotten loud. His property is to the north and west of the applicant. They are the ones who it directly affects the most. Bill Schallen, North Creek Road, asks to point out a couple things on the map. He indicates where the mulch pit is, nowhere near the Covell's; where the wood chips and fuel tank are, which is a double standard fuel tank, the same as what the Town has. He indicates that the driveway coming in is all paved to a certain point and then the rest is stone dust which is treated with calcium chloride in the summer to keep the dust down. Discussion takes place regarding adjourning or closing the public hearing.

**RESOLUTION – Robert Bacigalupo, Public Hearing**

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: J. Streit

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board closes the public hearing for the application of Robert Bacigalupo for a special use permit for property located at 4180 NYS Route 9N, TM#113.-1-82.

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, Gyarmathy, McKnight, Siragusa, Streit, Yassenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Weeks

B. Duffney states that he is the president of the Greenfield Community and Business Association of which B. Bacigalupo is a member and that he is friends with all the neighbors. He states that the letter from S. Foulke requests a restriction in hours to 8:00 to 5:00. As a self-employed logger, there are mornings that he leaves the house at 4:30 and does not get home until 9:00 or 10:00 p.m. He asks the applicant what his normal, average hours are. He realizes that there are some days that he is going to leave earlier and some days when the trucks will come back late. B. Bacigalupo states approximately 5:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. roughly. B. Duffney states that he understands when Pallette's or someone wants you there at a certain time, whether that is 5:00 a.m. or midnight. To restrict the hours from 8:00 to 5:00, that does not work in the construction world. He asks if all the trucks leave at 5:00. B. Bacigalupo states that they leave at different times, staggered times depending on where they are going, depending on the

April 29, 2014

weather, emergency jobs, etc. B. Duffney states that trucks have to be equipped with the reverse alarms. B. Bacigalupo states that he cannot turn them off. B. Duffney asks if the applicant has a loop around where they can back the trucks straight into the garage. B. Bacigalupo states yes. B. Duffney states that the backup alarm might be a minute or so, tops. He asks if they are put in the shops as soon as they come home, unless they are being washed. B. Bacigalupo concurs, sometimes they might stay out, but most of the time they go right into the garage. S. Foulke states that the issue that they have is that the existing situation is untenable, so they are asking that somehow the Board addresses the beeping which is happening at hours when people are sleeping and having their dinners, and she does not know if there is a way that something could happen that would change the way these trucks have to be maneuvered. B. Duffney states that he is trying to get to that point. In the winter, the trucks have to be inside or plugged in or they won't start. In the summer time, to reduce the noise level when everyone's windows are open, he asks if they can be looped around so that they could reduce some of the noise. B. Bacigalupo states yes. B. Duffney asks if the applicant works on Sundays. B. Bacigalupo states that on Sunday's he might wash the trucks, clean the yard up, he goes to camp or works at his mom's house. B. Duffney asks if that is with the big trucks. B. Bacigalupo states that it depends on what he is doing. B. Duffney asks regarding the idling of the trucks, A. Dingmon stated that the trucks have the automatic shutdowns on them and asks how long the applicant lets them cool down. B. Bacigalupo states that a couple of them have the shut downs and at least 3 to 5 minutes. DEC requires that it be no longer than 5 minutes. Regarding lighting, the request is that they be turned off by 6:00 p.m. B. Duffney questions if the applicant can put in some kind of down lighting. B. Bacigalupo states that he has LED motion detectors on the front and he can turn them down more if necessary. B. Duffney states that that would help with some of the issues. Regarding installing a dense green buffer of at least 100' in width, B. Duffney states that a buffer is going to take a while to grow and asks if the applicant has any objection to putting in a dirt berm with landscaping on top and seeding. He states that would eliminate the headlights, it would eliminate a lot of the noise; it would also deflect some of the diesel smoke. B. Bacigalupo asks how long, how wide, etc. T. Yasenchak states that the Code does require certain types of buffers between certain types of uses of properties. She states that the Board would ask the applicant to come up with a proposal for a buffer. B. Bacigalupo states that he would do something, trees, stockade fence. A. Dingmon states that the neighbor has requested trees and it used to be trees. If the applicant plants trees, it may take a little time. He lined evergreens on his property line and they have gotten bigger, it is a lower tree and it will block. Putting all that dirt along the whole side could be extremely expensive. If the neighbor wants trees and the applicant is willing to do trees, he thinks that would work. B. Duffney questions that the fuel storage tank is the newer type. B. Bacigalupo states that it is double lined and that DEC was at the property last Thursday and inspected the tank. B. Duffney discusses that the Planning Board can grant temporary permits and then revisit the application in a year. T. Yasenchak reviews that this is an application for a large contractor's storage yard, which is allowed in the LDR zone with a special use permit. She states that we have approved special use permits as temporary and then come back in a year to be reviewed. B. Duffney states that during the time of the discussions for the new zoning, he was heavily involved in these laws, fighting for what we actually have right now. He states that there are no restrictions on trailers; you could have 50 of them, just the heavy trucks. He suggests that regarding the vibration from the trucks, Route 9N is right there, the same as when we approved Mulholland's. There are trucks up and down 9N, 24/7. He suggests that the applicant could turn off the jake brakes. B. Bacigalupo states that he does that now. A. McKnight comments that the Code states that materials and supplies should be indoors unless approved by Special Use Permit. He states that mulch is an outdoor material and so he does not see any reason that it should not be stored outdoors. M. Gyarmathy states that he thinks that the applicant has heard the concerns of the neighbors, he thinks that the applicant needs to go to the drawing board and discuss possible solutions with the neighbors and bring back a site plan that is a little more detailed. He states it is a little confusing trying to decipher where things are from all the photos that were presented. He thinks that a resolution can be reached. T. Yasenchak asks if it would be easier if the Board did a site visit. Board is agreeable and a date and time will be discussed. A. McKnight states that the code also states that the garage should be 100' from the rear property line. B.

April 29, 2014

Bacigalupo states that he is unsure at this time. C. Baker states that regarding the discussion about a berm being a possible measure to provide a buffer, he does not know where the trees are in the photos, whose property they are on, but if you are talking about constructing a berm, bear in mind that you might have to take down any trees in order to build that berm, which in a sense is going to eliminate buffer that might be there now. T. Yasenchak asks if the applicant does his own oil changes on site and what happens with the waste oil. B. Bacigalupo states that he has an oil burning furnace. T. Yasenchak asks about washing the vehicles, where is the water going, where does he typically wash them. B. Bacigalupo states that is alongside the red garage and it is all dirt in that area. T. Yasenchak states that the applicant did mention that on Sundays he just does personal work, but the work week goes from Monday thru Saturday. B. Bacigalupo confirms this. T. Yasenchak states that as part of the Special Use Permit review does ask that the Board look at the hours of operation. She goes thru the requirements and states that some general ideas have been brought up. The applicant stated that he was amenable to changes in lighting. She asks that he come back with what he actually has and how he proposes to change that. Buffers were discussed and the applicant can come back with some options as to how to buffer the neighbors from sound, lighting and fumes. T. Yasenchak states that as part of the review, the Board would like specific hours of operation and the Board understands that having your own business, there are late hours. Because of the area with residences, we need to be conscious of all of those things. The Board would like a little more confirmation of the location of the buildings. The applicant has done a good job so far, but if we could have that more specific as far as setbacks, which way they are oriented, etc. B. Duffney states that the back shop, which is closest to Chandler Tractor, that business has been there for 40-plus years and that business is directly adjoining. He discusses tractor trailers, safety in general and the perception that the trucker is always at fault. He states that he does not believe that the applicant or any of his drivers would pull out in front of anyone intentionally. T. Siragusa states that there has been a lot of conversation and comments, some good observations, some things like personal vendettas – that kind of thing does not belong here. The kind of testimony that we have heard tonight, it seems like the things that reasonable neighbors can resolve. He does not know B. Bacigalupo, but the description of him sounds like all of our neighbors in Greenfield, the kind of guy who is going to stop what they are doing, come and help you. It seems like the personal issues can be resolved by fences, by manners, by talking to each other, etc., and that is what he thinks that Greenfield neighbors do. If something has changed in the last year it is probably because there is more business for the applicant and that is probably a good thing. He would guess that the applicant is thinking about being mindful of making mitigations to help the neighbors, maybe things are overblown, who knows. For all of the things that were discussed, it seems that these are things that can be resolved. It sounds like the applicant is the kind of person who is going to work to resolve them. Hopefully we will see less of the emotional kind of stuff and some resolution in the next meeting. It seems like we have a good business, it sounds like the kind of neighbors that we want in Greenfield so he is sure that we can figure something out. T. Yasenchak states that the Board will discuss and give the applicant some options for a site visit. She suggests that the applicant get the requested information to the Board ASAP. This will be on the next meeting agenda, May 13, 2014.

---

**TABOR ELLSWORTH – Site Plan Review**

Wilton Road

Tabor Ellsworth is present and explains that he would like to build a 936 square foot building on the property to assist in his farm business. That would allow him to process fruits and vegetables from the standpoint of washing and storage, prepare for sale. He has a 20C Food Processing license, he does value added products, which is fruit jams and jellies, and doing acidified food products, pickling products. He is currently expanding that and getting into some products that he does not grow. He is buying from other farms and is processing those as well. He currently has to process all those products in a certified kitchen so he does that off site. He has to take all the materials, bring them to a place where he rents time and then bring them home. He states that he rushed to get the application done so it is probably not

April 29, 2014

complete. He states that he knows that direct marketing of his agricultural products from the farm is an allowable use, but he wants to get everyone's opinions and for everyone to know what his intentions are with the value added products. T. Yasenchak states that in addition to the processing and storage of the vegetables and fruit, will he be selling from the site. T. Ellsworth states that he has been. Yes, all the products. He has a farm stand, seasonally, from the spring, strawberry season, to the fall, pumpkins. He was also selling the value added products on the honor system. He states that it is not a retail shop. At one point he had a pop-up tent with a table and then he just started putting it on the porch. T. Yasenchak reviews the plot plan that was submitted, the building will be 26' x 36', single story and he will still be selling off of the porch. T. Ellsworth states that is correct. T. Yasenchak asks about parking. T. Ellsworth states that people pull into the driveway and park there or on the lawn, not on the road. He states that he also has a 'pick-your-own'. T. Siragusa asks about the processing. T. Ellsworth explains that it is equivalent to home canning. He currently has a residential 4-burner stove that he purchased and installed at the certified kitchen where he rents space. The equipment required would be cooking utensils, containers, the stove and tables. For a 20C license and to get NYS Ag and Markets to sign off on the construction of the building he would need a 3-bay sink as well as a hand washing sink. They inspect the facility and will have to license it. T. Siragusa asks about employees. T. Ellsworth states that the only time he had employees was during pickling season. It is primarily family members, but he has had some friends help as well. His total payroll for pickling last year was about 65 hours, other than that he is doing it himself. T. Siragusa asks about retail hours. T. Ellsworth states that he basically brings the stuff out in the morning and back in at night. He does not have any published hours, his signage is minimal. He usually tries to put out a sign of what is available. T. Yasenchak asks if there will be additional signage. T. Ellsworth states that he is allowed a 2 x 3 sign. He had applied for a variance and was denied. He also states that he will not be having a bathroom. NYS Law requires that they have access to a bathroom for himself or any help, which means at the house is ok with them. He will be putting in a new septic system as he is generating gray water for which he will be getting an engineered plan. B. Duffney states that as the plot plan is laid out, the new structure will not be seen from the road. T. Yasenchak reviews the requirements. She asks about waste products from the processing, does he compost it, etc. T. Ellsworth states that he has been off site for most of the value added products, but he does compost some of it and depending on the season he does have pigs, as a hobby and not part of the farm business, and they will eat any scraps. He typically does not generate too much with the farm stand. C. Baker states that his question was answered regarding the septic. A public hearing is discussed and set for May 13, 2014. T. Yasenchak reviews some of the items that need to be added to the plans and reviewed such as where the driveway is, lighting, location in the parcel itself. This seems very straightforward.

---

**PRESTWICK CHASE – PUD Amendment & Country Squire Green Space Amendment**  
Denton Road

Luigi Palleschi and Dave Pentkowski are present. L. Palleschi presents and distributes copies of a progress print with some changes to the green space reconfiguration. He states that depending on the outcome of tonight's meeting he would make the final changes and make a formal submission. He reviews the 25.5 acre green space and the reconfiguration that had been proposed, which consisted of removing 7.41 acres from the area of Daniels Road and moving it to the southwestern portion. This amendment keeps the same configuration, eliminates one 8-unit building and adds 1.67 acres to the 25.5 acres. He points out that in the area of Daniels they have added to the buffer bringing the 75' to 100' along the lands of Haynes and he has added a strip of land along Daniels Road as an added open space where they are proposing a no clear cut. The 25.5 acres would become 27.22 acres of open space. He states that the subdivision amendment for open space goes hand-in-hand with the site plan that they are proposing for the amended PUD. He reviews that they are still proposing the relocation of some of the green space to the area behind Peter Goutos' home; he reviews the changes at the Daniels Road entrance; there is a National Grid easement through the green space and they can obviously cut their ROW within



April 29, 2014

that easement, but everything outside of that easement that they are proposing on the amended green space would be a no cut zone and he would work with the Town as to the language that is put on that; the entire PUD would go from 89.7 acres to 88.03 acres; they are proposing an additional 50' of buffer behind the Farmstead Bed & Breakfast, which causes them to pull building #4 further away from that property; there was a cul-de-sac along the western property line with the units right up against the open space and they have pulled that back a little bit to provide an additional 50' buffer there as well. They have revised buildings 7, 8, 35 and 36. T. Siragusa asks if the overall number of units has changed. L. Palleschi states that has remained the same. The building that they are removing from the Daniels Road area has been relocated. He states that he has left the building numbers the same so that we can see where the buildings are moved to. He states that the connection to Daniels Road is important to all of us. It is about 1000' of road from Daniels Road just passed the National Grid easement. That is pretty costly so they need the units on that road to supplement the cost of the road infrastructure, etc., for that connection. J. Streit states that he was more or less in favor of this project as has been designed, but that the last public meeting we heard an awful lot of strong voices from the Daniels Road and Country Squire residents, who expressed views that they felt betrayed and misrepresented. He states that now, and he believes that L. Palleschi is doing an honest job, as best he can, of representing the applicant, he does not feel very good about the transfer of the green space from the Daniels Road segment to behind P. Goutos' house. At the moment, he is not inclined to feel that that part of the plan should go forth. M. Gyarmathy agrees with J. Streit. He does not agree with the idea of relocating the green space. Once it was allocated to Country Squire Estates, he thinks it should stay there. He read the minutes from the last meeting and he does understand that there are problems with green space and in the past a Planning Board did not require an HOA, and this is a large burden on the contractor for taxes, etc. He still strongly feels that once this green space is established, it needs to remain as it was established. T. Siragusa states that his statement from last week was that he thinks there is a big precedent there; it opens a can of worms for future developments. He does not think it is entirely black and white, but it is a precedent that he would like to avoid and not set. S. Weeks had an interesting point last time in saying that some of it might have been brought on by the Planning Board because we didn't realize that we had the green space issue at the time and we pushed pretty hard for that road extension as an emergency entrance. T. Siragusa states that he knows that people are concerned about traffic but there is a traffic study, so leaving traffic and safety out of it, it is important, but we have addressed it. He does appreciate the work that has been done because he thinks it is pretty creative to try to make a difference here. He is still uncomfortable with making changes that a past Board agreed to, that a public assumed it would be theirs as a green space and now we are moving it. J. Bokus states that he likes the idea of the road and understands the cost of construction. The whole green space issue would be much simpler if a HOA had been created. T. Yasenchak states that the Town Code does not require an HOA be created as part of a cluster subdivision or when there is green space associated with a cluster subdivision. J. Bokus states that to get the road, the economics of it, it would almost seem to be the Planning Board has to allow the transfer of green space so because of that he is in favor of it. T. Yasenchak asks L. Palleschi to review the number of units at the Daniels Road entrance. L. Palleschi states that there are eight 2-story units and four buildings at 7 units for a total of 36 units. T. Yasenchak states that those 36 that are on that side could possibly be placed in other locations that would be able to account for the price of building the road. Discussion takes place about relocation. L. Palleschi states that his biggest argument has been that while we have the existing 25.5 acres in this configuration, it allowed for a golf course and they are proposing this as a no cut zone. He states that he would hope that the public would be in favor of the no clear cutting of the trees. A. McKnight states that he understood that the golf course had to be in the PUD and not in the green space that belongs to Country Squire. M. Hill explains. L. Palleschi states that if they change the configuration, then an amendment to the existing PUD is still something viable vs some of the Board members saying no to amending any of it. T. Yasenchak states that perhaps if that continued to stay green space, there may be another way to have the road, as there is already a strip of land there that is not part of the green space and then to relocate those units to another area. B. Duffney states that he is still in favor of the road coming out on to Daniels Road as you need another way in and out of there, with the number of people

April 29, 2014

proposed, in case of an emergency. He is confused about a previous Planning Board allowing Prestwick Chase to take part of Country Squires green space. T. Yasenchak states that they did not allow it to be taken; they allowed it to be used for part of the golf course as the golf course would be more of a passive use and it would still be green. L. Palleschi shows the Board a plan for the golf course. J. Streit states that he does not find the argument that we can put in a golf course, we have absolutely no intention of putting in a golf course, but since we are not putting in a golf course we should be allowed to cut the trees between Daniels Road and the easement – he does not find that a convincing argument that that is why we should switch those 7 acre parcels. L. Palleschi states that the original plan allowed for single family houses where they are now preserving that area and there were more residential houses along Denton Road. Overall he feels that they are still suiting the people along Country Squire but also the people along the western side. M. Hill states that the current proposal is to not have a golf course and the existing Country Squire Estates green space, the restrictions that are imposed on that state that ‘the area is to be used as a portion of the golf course, otherwise to be retained in its natural state’. So the Planning Board approving the use for the golf course, based on the condition that was imposed, seemed to be pretty clearly indicating that it could be cleared if it was to be used for a golf course. C. Baker questions that the newly proposed no cut area at Daniels Road could affect the traffic study. L. Palleschi states that they pulled it back far enough.

A public hearing is reopened at 9:20 p.m. Paul Bouchard, Denton Road, distributes some information and speaks about Lyme disease and open space. Cathy Paton, Country Squire, states that her concern is for safety on Daniels Road. She has no problem with the development as the Town could use the additional tax base; however, Daniels Road needs to be addressed. She reiterates her concerns about safety and how dangerous Daniels Road is. She states that she spoke to some people at the Wilton Fire Department who were unaware of this, Maple Avenue. They said that in Wilton the Town Board advises them of something like this that could be happening, especially if you have 3-stories to be able to get a ladder truck in on Daniels Road, they were shocked. She states that someone called over to our town to ask why they weren’t aware of this. She thinks that we should have experts come and look at something like this before any decisions would be made. She has been to the meetings before as it was brought up that where have these people been. J. Bokus asks what she would like to see done with Daniels. C. Paton states that you cannot see coming out onto Daniels Road, making a left. She discusses the amount of traffic going thru there, states that Daniels Road is dangerous for anyone and she worries about the senior citizens in Prestwick Chase. Tim Laskey, Country Squire, states that he agrees with one thing on the drawing, that is amendments to the Country Squire Estates plan. He thinks we are setting a dangerous precedent. The green space was delineated and set forth as a green space for Country Squire. That was the intent when they moved in there. To basically take that away, is a very dangerous precedent for the Board and the Town for future development. Going forward and saying that it would be changed from forever wild to a golf course, he states that he can see that, but to actually take the green space and move it completely to another end of the property which is probably 2/10ths of a mile away, that completely changes the intent of some of the green space which was the buffer, not only to protect Country Squire from Prestwick, but even to protect people on Daniels Road possibly from Country Squire. A buffer works both ways. He states that there is pretty much a unanimous agreement with the people on Country Squire, Locust, Denton; the only people they didn’t talk to were people on Bloomfield. That country block has really seen a significant change in the last year between solar panels, a possible expansion of the Polo group. That is becoming a real cluster of development and pretty much every resident in Country Squire, and even in the minutes, some folks on Liberty, can hear pumps, well tanks, etc., running during the day and especially at night. He appreciates that in the minutes it states that the developer moved them in even farther than what they agreed upon. That doesn’t change the fact that you still hear them. The green space as it is now is marginal at best and to change it is going to significantly impact, most or all of the people who were here at the last meeting. He comments on the Bed & Breakfast on Locust, that that is their livelihood, that is their business, their income and if you are coming to Saratoga, you are looking for a place out in the Country vs. the city. That business is definitely going to be affected

April 29, 2104

because of what they are going to look at. T. Laskey states that in the minutes of the last meeting, we really need to consider that there was a lot of input, a lot of emotion behind it. The bottom line is that the people, almost unanimously, all the way around it feel very strongly that their neighborhood, their quality of life is going to be affected. Andy Taylor, states that he still owns the family home on Daniels Road which they purchase in 1973. He knows that road; it is very dangerous, far more dangerous now than when he was a kid. He states that he also speaks for the gentleman who owns the house; he bought his family home back, the house directly across the street with the pond. Of all people who will be directly impacted by this will be him. A. Taylor urges the Board, the previous Board agreed to leave that as a green space, whether it be a golf course or as it is now, but he thinks it would be a no brainer. You don't change it. That's what was intended, that's what the public hearings were about when it was built and approved years ago. Also, this is hundreds of new units. What happens if seniors don't rent them? Is it going to be families? Is the applicant going to come back and say that he can't fill these places? If it's families, think of what that would do for the traffic on Daniels. Hayim Schwartzman, Daniels Road, states that when they bought their house in 2000, they were told that the property behind them was green space, no one was going to build there, but there was talk of a potential golf course. One thing he worries about in that area is the value of his house. He does not particularly know if he would like a golf course or not, but he does not think that it would reduce the value of his home, it might even increase it. If you put some cluster homes near Daniels Road in place of the green space, he worries that it affects the value of the houses in that area. T. Yasenchak asks about the 8' strip of land that extends from the green space along his property. H. Schwartzman states that he does not know but he does maintain it, he mows it, etc. and he put a driveway thru there. Peter Goutos, Denton Road, states that one of the problems that we all face when a development is approved and then re-proposed is that it has an opportunity to put the neighbors at odds. He lives on Denton and has neighbors on Daniels Road, we face the same problem and that is roadways that are not designed for the amount of traffic – quantity, capacity and frequency – that we have now. Denton Road is a straight line drag strip now. He states that the same things happen on both roads. He is not an advocate to disrupt this block and this neighborhood, but he wants to let the Board know that he thinks it would be patently unfair to have a development proposed of this size and have the entire burden of the traffic come out on Denton Road. He thinks that there is a reason why others have asked for, including himself, to have an access to Daniels Road. It is that you do not want to put the full burden on one road and suffer all the consequences of that. We have a traffic problem and we have to fix it. We have tried to, we tried to get some cooperation on speed limits, etc. and didn't get it, but we are not done. The second thing he wanted to clarify for the neighbors, and the Board is aware of this, it has been a long time since he approached F. McNeary to purchase the property behind his house. It is not something that has just come up and the reallocation of the green space on this development in consideration of the Country Squire development is nothing that he had anything to do with. He is an advocate, and solely an advocate of taking the area behind his house, Saratoga Farmstead and Locust Grove and preserving it. Some members of the Board have said that he is probably not making good economic sense in trying to purchase it and tie it up, but that is what he is trying to do. Things change over time and perhaps there will be a PUD III that is proposed, and maybe suddenly that piece of property is interesting and he or his children will be fighting a battle over it. He respectfully asks the Board, he is still attempting to do what he said he would, and he has not been able to get that done. If things don't happen in that manner, he would respectfully ask the Board to try to preserve that space in the manner in which it was intended initially before the reallocation and currently as proposed as green space to protect the neighbors in that area. Anna Schwartzman, Daniels Road, thanks the Board for being here and listening to the neighbors, for showing them the maps and making the changes. She states that the changes tonight are better than last time, but she still worries about the precedent of the Board changing the green space for people in the future. She does walk and bike on Daniels Road. She wants to make it safer; she wants to be there so she is there. She wears protective clothing, she walks on the side, she walks towards traffic. It is not that far into Saratoga. They can make it work if we just get together. She would love to be able to walk thru the green space, thru Prestwick Chase. She is a little iffy on the road. If you didn't have the homes there, she would say that if you feel you need the road for safety, then do so,

April 29, 2014

but she does not agree that the houses have to be there for the road. You shouldn't have to even change that green space, she does not know how much the road would alter that in the legal sense. Ron Owen, Daniels Road, states that he has a concern with traffic. He indicates where his property is located. He is concerned about the traffic coming down the road, he can't even cross the street because of the traffic. He states that someone said that Prestwick Chase is not going to fix the road, he states that they are not going to make it any better. He is deathly afraid of what is going to happen. It is not just the amount of traffic; it is the speed at which they come down the road. He questions that the traffic study that was done states that it is ok to put the road there because it meets the standards. He would like to know whose study that is. T. Yasenchak explains that any applicant hires a traffic engineer; it is on record and is stamped by a licensed engineer. It is done using the State's standards. R. Owen asks how far it is going to be from the road to the creek. His question is based on how much distance someone will have to see a car pulling in or out of the access road. He also questions the location of the access gate, where it is going to be located, how far from Daniels Road to the gate. He states that by the way the houses are structured; it is going to be pretty close so does that mean that there is going to be a delay in people turning into the access road. R. Owen states that he sent a letter to the Planning Board with three concerns – precedence setting, traffic on Daniels Road, and diminishment of properties for all the neighbors and homeowners in the area. He states that his biggest concern is the traffic. If another access road is needed, he suggests putting it on Denton Road. This is the worst place in the Town of Greenfield to have an accident. T. Yasenchak states that as we just received some of this information today and the public has not had a chance to look at it, that it would be in everyone's best interest to adjourn the public hearing at 9:48 p.m.

T. Siragusa states that given feedback tonight, comments from the Board, comments from the public, what are the chances that we will have new information at the next meeting? The Board and the public expect to have material ahead of time to review so that they can comment. L. Palleschi states that he can make revisions to the plan and have it to the Town Hall early next week. T. Yasenchak states that she would like C. Baker and M. Hill to address the question of the traffic study. She states that the traffic has been addressed, not only with the Country Squire green space but also when we had the original public hearing for the amendment to the PUD. She states that we are all really aware; most of us drive that road all the time. Although we may not live there, we understand. She asks for clarification for the public that there are professional engineers who do studies according to the NYS DOT Standards. They put grades on the road for level of use or level of service. She asks if the Planning Board can only review this by looking as if the road is used legally. For instance, if people are speeding, how does that affect the way the Board looks at things? How do we reconcile that? M. Hill states that the Board has to consider the information in the traffic report and whether it is a traffic report that is prepared by the Board or by the engineer and is reviewed by or for the Board. That is the material that the Board has to consider as part of the application. He states that we have obviously gotten comments from the public about concerns about the traffic on Daniels Road and the speed at which people drive. If they exceed the speed limit, that is an enforcement issue. This Board can, in making its recommendation to the Town Board, if the process moves forward and there is ultimately a recommendation to the Town Board about whether the PUD should be amended as proposed, as part of that recommendation this Board can certainly urge the Town Board to consult with the State and County authorities about making requests for changes to speed limits and enforcement practices that are followed with regard to Daniels Road. The Planning Board does not have enforcement authority. It cannot direct that different speed limit signs be posted, etc. The Board has to go by the traffic report which assumes that people are operating their vehicles legally. C. Baker states that the traffic engineers have guidelines by both the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Authority, which is AASHTO, and regulations that are posted by NYS DOT. When they do the reports, there are published requirements for stopping sight distance, for intersection sight distance, there is a specific criteria for how you measure that distance, where the car is projected to be seen, etc. There is a specific set of guidelines that they have to go thru when they calculate their sight distance measurements and they compare those measurements to the posted DOT requirements and the AASHTO requirements. If there is a deficiency there, they have to identify it and that it does not meet the sight

April 29, 2014

distance. This Board, in the past, has turned down projects because the proposed intersections do not meet the sight distance requirements. The engineer who prepared this traffic report went thru that process and his conclusions stated that it does meet the sight distance criteria established by DOT and by AASHTO. From the Board's perspective, from the Town Engineer's perspective and from the Town Attorney's perspective, we have done the due diligence that is required of this Board and we are basically defaulting our decisions to that engineer's conclusions and report. He is putting his NYS licensed stamp on that report and that is what we are basing our decisions on. T. Yasenchak states that is based on the road as it is proposed, not necessarily at other locations which may not meet that standard. C. Baker states that he is talking specifically about the proposed intersection that is shown on the site plan. T. Yasenchak states that as part of that review, they look at that as far as that road being maintained correctly for snow, etc. C. Baker states that there is criteria for the grade of the road that they are tying into, curvature of the road they are tying into – it is a quite involved process that they have to go thru to reach those conclusions. M. Gyarmathy asks if that is based on the posted speed limit on the road or the average speed limit that they observe on the road. C. Baker states that the requirement is that it be based on the posted speed limit for the road. There is a provision that they can go to a lesser speed limit if they do what is called an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed limit. If they can prove that the traffic is going less than the speed limit, they can do an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile study, put counters out and measure the actual speed on the road and then they can design for that lower speed limit. But the requirement is to design for the posted speed limit. M. Gyarmathy asks if the Planning Board can ask the Town Board to check the speed on that road. T. Yasenchak states that we have already done that and she believes that the neighbors have already asked the Town Board to do that. L. Palleschi states that they had originally designed that intersection based on what they felt that people were traveling thru the "S" curve, not to be the posted speed limit, but to be around 30 mph because the posted speed limit and going thru that "S" curve is very difficult to do. Instead, they moved the intersection so that they would gain more sight distance based on the posted speed limit and the intersection sight distance. T. Yasenchak states that she wanted to clarify that for the audience. That the Board can only review things to a certain degree and there are certain things that are beyond the Board's purview. Perhaps the Town can be asked again. The traffic engineer also looks at how that road will be affected with the additional traffic. B. Duffney states that regarding the Fire Department, early into this didn't we do something. L. Palleschi states that he recalls a representative being here who spoke and was in favor of the project. B. Duffney states that was Mike Chandler. T. Yasenchak states that the height of the buildings are within the zoning regulations. The Zoning regulations have specific height requirements based on the equipment that services the buildings. B. Duffney states that maybe the question was asked early on, but as A. Taylor brought up, what happens if all these apartments are built and there are not enough seniors to build them. L. Palleschi states that the Planning Board would be recommending to the Town Board that the PUD allow an age restricted group here. The Town has that restriction. The applicant would have to come back and ask to amend the PUD to allow such a thing. He states that the applicant has done studies that would accommodate this development. Once they get thru the Town Board and come back to the Planning Board for site plan review, they would look at phasing the project, which was discussed. B. Duffney asks about the distance from the road to the creek. L. Palleschi is not sure that the brook is on these plans. Map is reviewed and it is more than 350'. L. Palleschi states that the gate at the Daniels Road entrance would be approximately 100' from the edge of the road as it is now. It is discussed that that would accommodate approximately 5 cars. L. Palleschi states that is also something that can be looked at during site plan review. B. Duffney states that he knows that the gate is operational at the other end. L. Palleschi states that this will be the same; they do not want this to become a cut-thru from Daniels to Denton. Discussion takes place that fire trucks will have the ability to open these gates so there should be no delay. C. Baker states that L. Palleschi mentioned that he was going to come back with an amended plan and is he talking about this amended plan that we are looking at or something else. L. Palleschi states something different from what we see here tonight. T. Yasenchak states that L. Palleschi has heard a lot of comment from the public and the Board with reservations regarding the precedent that the Board does not want to set in reconfiguring green space or reconfiguring the intent of the original green space. We all still like the

April 29, 2014

green space on the south western portion, we like the buffer as well. She states that from hearing the Board, she feels that they do not feel that the intent of the original green space is met when it is stretched to the other side of the property. She states that this Board has not seen a reconfiguration of green space before but they do not want to be the Board that sets that precedent. L. Palleschi states that he thinks that the Board is definitely in favor of connecting that road to Daniels. J. Streit states if it can be done safely. T. Siragusa states that because of the green space being removed, the other thing that has been mentioned a couple of times is that the overall increase in density is about 25% of the original amendment plan. That gives the applicant the opportunity to kind of preserve the idea of new green space on the west and south west, and preserving that area. That would be new green space that might offset concerns, at least for him, for density.

---

**WITT CONSTRUCTION – Major Subdivision Amendment**  
Old Stone Ridge

Applicant requested postponement.

---

**DISCUSSION**

T. Yasenchak thanks Andy McKnight for being part of the Board over the past year and wishes him the best in his future endeavors.

C. Baker states that he received a call about the T. Makkay subdivision on Goose Hollow Road. The applicant would like to extend the length of the road for phase one by 100' so that they can get a couple more lots on it. They would like to know if they need to come back before the Planning Board to show the new phase one lines or is that something that T. Yasenchak can do when signing the plans. T. Yasenchak asks if they will be including the hammer head in that. C. Baker states that they will. Board consensus is that if C. Baker is ok with the changes, T. Yasenchak can sign off on it. C. Baker states that they will be revising the road bond as well.

Site visit is discussed for the Bacigalupo application and set for Saturday, May 3<sup>rd</sup> at 8:00 a.m.

R. Rowland states that the night of the May 27<sup>th</sup> Planning Board meeting is also Grievance Night and the Assessor's office generally uses this Board room. We will be relocating the Planning Board meeting to the Community Center.

Meeting adjourned 10:17 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland  
Secretary