

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD**

**PLANNING BOARD**

**February 11, 2014**

**REGULAR MEETING**

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by Tonya Yasenchak at 7:03 p.m. On roll call, the following members are present: Tonya Yasenchak, Nathan Duffney, Michael Gyarmathy, Andrew McKnight, John Streit, and John Bokus, Alternate. Thomas Siragusa and Stan Weeks are absent. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer is present.

---

**MINUTES – January 28, 2014**

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: J. Streit

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of January 28, 2014, as presented with the changes to the language of the contingencies for the Skidmore Site Plan approval as requested by the Town Counsel and forwarded to the Planning Board members.

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, Gyarmathy, McKnight, Streit, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Abstain: Weeks, Siragusa

---

**PRESTWICK CHASE – PUD Amendment**

Denton Road

The applicant has requested that this case be postponed to the next meeting to give them additional time to gather information regarding the open space questions. T. Yasenchak states that we will not be discussing this project without a representative present. Paul Bouchard had left a letter with the office earlier this evening and Rosemary Jensen and Peter Goutos provide the Board with letters at this time, each with concerns regarding the project. These letters will be distributed to the Board members.

---

**RONALD MOREHOUSE – Minor Subdivision**

NYS Route 9N and Canty Road

Ronald Morehouse and David Barass are present. D. Barass states that the applicant is requesting a 4-lot subdivision at the corner of NYS Route 9N and Canty Road. He states that the Board had expressed concern regarding the possibility of wetlands being on the site and the sight distance for the driveways. D. Barass states that Jed Hayden from DEC visited the site and has provided a letter stating that there are no regulated DEC wetlands on the site. The applicant retained Creighton Manning to do a traffic study and sight distance study. Based on their expertise, we have revised the drawing to move the driveway for lot 4 to be in compliance and Mark Nadolny is present and can address any questions regarding the study. T. Yasenchak states that the traffic study was received at the office on February 7, so the Board received it in their packets tonight. M. Nadolny reviews the study and how the results were arrived at. They set up traffic counters, used 25 mph as the guideline and they recommended some clearing and earth work, which the applicant has undertaken. They did shift the driveways a bit away from the curve. A. McKnight questions that the driveway for lot 3 is coming out onto 9N and shouldn't it

February 11, 2014

be 55 mph. M. Nadolny states that it actually comes out onto Canty Road and then on to 9N. He states that he also drove the southbound bound and tried to make the right turn in as quickly as possible. The fastest he could do it was 30 mph and that was using the outside lane. In order to stay in your designated lane as you were coming southbound, you would have to slow down to probably a minimum of 25 mph. He reiterates that the fastest he could do it was 30 without running over the gravel shoulders. C. Baker has no comments at this time. T. Yasenchak states that the Board has received the letter from DEC. C. Baker states that due to the amount of material that has been moved, he would like to see a storm water erosion and sediment control plan in place for this project. It should have been in place prior to all of that material being moved, but it does need to be done. C. Baker states that he did speak to G. McKenna who believes that the disturbance is close to an acre if not over, so it is required by the State. The applicant would also need to file an NOI with the State to have permission to do what has been done. As part of that, C. Baker would like to see an updated topo on the site, a grading plan to show what the final intent is for the material that has been moved. D. Barass states that the topo has been updated with the exception of the most recent work done right along the edge of the road. R. Morehouse states that he just needs to taper it back from the road and make it look better. C. Baker states that those are the types of things that need to be shown on the erosion and sediment control plan and grading plan. He also states that he thinks that we should have a sign-off letter from ACOE as well. D. Barass states that they have been there. R. Morehouse states that they would be glad to provide a letter if needed. T. Yasenchak asks if the mobile home and septic on lot 2 is staying the way that it is. Applicant confirms. T. Yasenchak asks if there is any topo involved with lot 1. D. Barass states that they did not do topo on that site; where there was earth work being done and there are some severe slopes. This was an existing lot with a mobile home on it. C. Baker states that there has been fill dumped on that lot. R. Morehouse states that there has, to level it off. C. Baker states that as part of the disturbance plan for the SWPPP they are going to need to show those areas. T. Yasenchak states that the applicant has addressed the traffic; we just need a chance to look at it, have the Town Engineer look at it and see if we have any additional questions about it. C. Baker asks if we sent this application to DOT and asks that it be done. A public hearing is discussed and set for February 25, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. Discussion takes place regarding the existing curb cut being shared. It is not a shared driveway, just a shared curb cut and then the driveways are on their own properties. T. Yasenchak states that we should ask the Town Attorney about any kind of language necessary for the shared curb cut. The shared curb cut is in the right-of-way, to access the road and the driveways are on their own properties. The area that they are going to be sharing will have to be plowed to get access to the driveways. They technically do not need an easement to anyone, but we also don't know if the curb cut is technically wide enough for two separate driveways. D. Barass states that they could widen the curb cut and then it would be two separate driveways. C. Baker states that we should get any comments from DOT.

---

## **DISCUSSION**

C. Baker states that he is looking to wrap up his review of the Goose Hollow subdivision this week. He reiterates that it is a major subdivision with a Town road. As soon as he is finished with the review he will get a copy of his comments to everyone. He would imagine that they will want to be on the agenda as quickly as possible because they need to get the plans signed by DOH. R. Rowland states that the Fire Department has the plans; she has e-mailed M. Chandler reminding him that the Planning Board was looking for input.

Joe Szpak is in the audience and he sent the Planning Board a letter regarding Old Stone Ridge, and was just here to see if it was going to be discussed. T. Yasenchak states that no application has been submitted, G. McKenna is working on what needs to be done with that. She states that right now it is not within the Planning Board's purview, but from her understanding there is a submittal pending.

February 11, 2014

T. Yasenchak states that most of the Planning Board members were at the conference. Maybe for the next meeting, if anyone has anything that they want to share. J. Streit states that he had a question regarding one of the classes where they gave examples of the wrong way to do things. One of the scenarios was that it was stated that a case had already been discussed in executive session. He was going to ask M. Hill tonight when, if ever, is it appropriate for a Board to go into executive session. R. Rowland states that she did send that question to M. Hill and had asked him to address it at this meeting. T. Yasenchak states that M. Hill will be at the next meeting and we will have him explain it.

T. Yasenchak states that there is information in everyone's packets regarding additional opportunities for classes.

T. Yasenchak suggests being careful with comments in e-mails and to watch who is in the cc line.

---

Meeting adjourned 7:31 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland  
Secretary