

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD**

February 23, 2016

REGULAR MEETING

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

MINUTES – February 9, 2016

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: J. Streit

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of February 9, 2016, as submitted.

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

PLANNING BOARD CASE

DANIEL & GAIL COCHRAN – Minor Subdivision

Lake Desolation Road

Daniel Cochran is present and explains that he would like to subdivide one lot for his daughter. There were a couple questions at the last meeting.

A public hearing is opened at 7:03 p.m. There being no public comments, this public hearing is closed.

S. Weeks states that the Board had requested sight distance information. D. Cochran states that he got the ASHTO regulations and at 60 mph it calls for 575-feet, the speed limit on Lake Desolation Road is 55 mph, and he has 677-feet. T. Siragusa asks if this is from a certified engineer. C. Baker questions how this was measured. He states that there is a certain protocol as to how it is measured. D. Cochran states that he will get an engineer. S. Weeks states that the Planning Board had decided some time ago that they need sight distances certified by an engineer to be sure that we have adequate distance. We need this information before we proceed. B. Duffney questions that we will not need to reopen the public hearing for the new information. S. Weeks states that we can reopen the public hearing if we decide that we need to. J. Streit states that last time we discussed that the applicant is employing an easement where if they simply drew a line differently, that would not be necessary. Is it possible that they can do a simple line adjustment as it approaches the road so that that property, in the shaded area on the map, belongs to the new parcel? D. Cochran states no, because he wants the frontage. He has approximately 70 acres and he wants 250' on the frontage. He does not want to diminish that. He does not mind giving an easement; it's not a big thing. M. Gyarmathy states that we also had a discussion about the driveway location and D. Cochran said that was the best spot for the driveway because of the steep bank. D. Cochran explains that past the telephone pole it gets really steep. He indicates that he does not think that he will need a switchback. He will get an engineer to do the sight distance report and would like to keep the driveway as it is. He does not want to give up the frontage, they want to give their daughters their lots and still have the frontage according to the code. M.

February 23, 2016

Gyarmathy questions that we need the easement language. S. Weeks states that we did ask for that. There were two things we asked for – one was the sight distance and the other was the easement language so that the Town Attorney can check to make sure it is appropriate. R. Roeckle states that if the engineer is going out to review the sight distance, could they also look at whether it would be a possibility to move the driveway so that it is all on the one property without the easement. D. Cochran asks why the Board has a problem with the easement, this is family. R. Roeckle states that it is not always going to be family and easements create problems in the long term. D. Cochran states that he has a shared driveway with his other daughter and is that a bigger issue. S. Weeks states that shared driveways are issues because the same people are not going to be there down the road. The Board is always uneasy about shared driveways and easement language. T. Siragusa states that we try to minimize it, if there is a way to not have them. R. Roeckle states that if the engineer says that it would be physically impossible to move the driveway up... D. Cochran states that the Board is putting undue burden on him as far as getting engineers to figure this out and he does not agree with it at all. R. Roeckle states that he suggested it only because the engineer is going to need to be there to review the sight distance. D. Cochran reiterates that he disagrees. S. Weeks states that the Board is asking the applicant specifically for the easement language and the certification of the sight distance. He states that no one has stated that they would not approve it with the easement language, just that it would be simpler if it wasn't necessary. In looking at the site, S. Weeks states that he understands why the applicant feels he needs to have the driveway in that location. D. Cochran states that he agrees, having been on the Board for 9 years, that you mitigate those kinds of things.

INTEGRATED STAFFING – Site Plan Review

Maple Avenue

Peter and Dhianna Yezzi and Kevin Hastings, engineer, are present. K. Hastings states that they are running parallel with the ZBA for some area variances. They have provided a new drawing with more details for both Boards. They have shown sign detail, a planting buffer along Maple Avenue and they have consulted with a local landscaper. D. Yezzi states that they did remove one parking space in the front as was requested. S. Weeks questions the distance from the first parking space to the road. K. Hastings states that it is 12' – 14', including the 10' buffer area. The sign would be located in the center. The ZBA had requested site photos and copies of the deeds and those have been provided to both Boards. S. Weeks questions that they are on the ZBA agenda for March 1st. B. Duffney asks how many variances. K. Hastings states one variance but it involves 3 parameters because it is an existing lot. B. Duffney states that he drove by and it is a small lot. He questions location of the well to the north. K. Hastings provides a handout showing wells and septic on the subject lot and adjoining lots. He explains that he walked the property to the north with N. King who stated that he has 2 or 3 additional wells on the property that are used only for irrigation purposes with the potable well in the front. C. Baker states that in that area wells can be in the basements as that was typical of the area. K. Hastings states that the fences in the area all appear to be on the property lines. R. Roeckle questions that the existing property that they are changing to an office was a residence, so it is a change in use to the property and the lot to the rear is a residence. He states that his only concern is that because of the shared driveway, the gravel driveway being on the property line, and the requirement for a Type A 10' landscape buffer, there is no buffer on that property line because it is physically impossible. He just wants to make sure that if they are getting a variance, that that is somehow included in this. G. McKenna has told the Board that there is no requirement to have parking in the rear, but he did reference the buffer standards and those clearly state a 10' buffer between an office space and a residence. K. Hastings states that their position is that what is there existing is good vegetation, the fence line is there. R. Roeckle states that his concern is not the property to the south of the stockade fence, it is the actual narrow 20' driveway that the subject property shares. That is a property line, that is a residential property and it is also a driveway to which the code states there is to be a 10' buffer. He states that he is concerned that the ZBA should take that into consideration when doing their variance. This is a perfectly acceptable use to him and a fairly decent plan, but if you need a variance, you need a variance. T. Siragusa states that he thinks it is a good project; the challenge is the engineering and variances, etc. He is generally positive for lot improvement and fitting within the existing community. He states that they did a lot of good work here but

February 23, 2016

questions that he missed any new lighting. D. Yezzi states that there is only going to be lighting by the door; they are not going to have anyone out there after 5:00 p.m. so they don't need anything in the lots at all. The employees will be going out the back door and there will a light there, just a 100-watt bulb. B. Duffney states a porch light. D. Yezzi concurs. B. Duffney questions about how many people they would have in and out during the course of a day. D. Yezzi states that they have 4 internal associates including herself and 4 people who would come in and interview throughout the course of the day – that is the max. M. Gyarmathy states that this is a good project and he appreciates all the work that they have done. J. Streit questions what the applicants do. D. Yezzi explains that they are a temporary staffing company; they have a location in Glens Falls and they are currently on West Avenue in Saratoga and have been there since 2009; and they are looking for a little building for their offices. S. Weeks states that since they have gone to 2 parking spaces in front, how are they going to deal with the issues of the difficulties of people pulling in off of the main road. D. Yezzi states that they are going to have the employees park in the front spaces and the people coming in for interviews will park in the back along with the handicap spot for herself. S. Weeks states that the buffer issue has to be discussed with the ZBA. He believes that we can declare that the application is complete and set a public hearing for the next meeting. Board concurs. C. Baker states that he thinks that the plan looks good and he agrees with R. Roeckle's comment regarding the landscaping buffer. K. Hastings states that he understands the concern now. B. Duffney questions that the ZBA is going to cover the buffer at the driveway. C. Baker states that they have to. There is not enough room to do anything, so it has to be covered by a variance. B. Duffney states that he looked at it and does not think it is going to be a major issue because of the amount of proposed traffic, as discussed. S. Weeks states that this would appropriately be discussed by the ZBA.

Meeting adjourned 7:30 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary