

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

JANUARY 26, 2010

REGULAR MEETING

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

MINUTES – January 12, 2010

MOTION: T. Yasenchak

SECOND: L. Dupouy

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and accepts the minutes of January 12, 2010, with minor corrections.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Yasenchak, Duffney, Dupouy, Siragusa

Absent: Streit, Thraikill

Noes: None

PLANNING BOARD CASES

G. JUDSON KILMER – Minor Subdivision

Lake Desolation

David Barass is present for the application. A public hearing is opened at 7:02 p.m. D. Barass explains that the applicant owns 85 acres and would like to subdivide one 12-acre lot. This is an agricultural field, and the applicant is under contract to sell it as a stand-alone lot to the neighbor and it complies with current zoning. Henry Peterson, questions that the lot is going to be sold to a neighbor. D. Barass states that it is under contract to Mr. DeLorenzo who has no immediate plans to build on it. The house location is shown to prove that there is a buildable area. G. Dake explains that the Planning Board cannot approve a lot which cannot be buildable. There being no further public comments, this public hearing is closed at 7:03 p.m. C. Baker states that he sees no issues, this is a straightforward subdivision, it is a large lot and he is comfortable that they will be able to find an area for a septic system if they ever do build there. G. Dake states that there are no additional comments from G. McKenna. **The Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered “no”. T. Yasenchak makes a motion to check Box B, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impacts. B. Duffney seconds the motion. All present in favor.**

RESOLUTION – G. Judson Kilmer, Minor Subdivision

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: L. Dupouy

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants minor subdivision approval to G. Judson Kilmer for property located at 52/54 Lake Desolation Road, TM#149.-2-26 as per the map submitted.

January 26, 2010

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Yasenchak, Duffney, Dupouy, Siragusa
Absent: Streit, Thrailkill
Noes: None

JILL CUNNINGHAM – Minor Subdivision

Locust Grove Road

G. Dake recuses himself. J. Cunningham is present. T. Yasenchak reviews that the applicant was previously before the Planning Board but needed to get an area variance for acreage, which she has done. J. Cunningham states that the survey is done, the wetlands were flagged, it is not on the market yet, but she does have a couple of builders looking at the property. T. Yasenchak notes that the driveway was moved from the northern boundary line to the southern. T. Yasenchak reads from G. McKenna's notes that if this is going to be a keyhole lot, it must have 40' of frontage or the applicant will need to get another variance. C. Baker provides a copy of the typical notes for the applicant. He states that since the building envelope is very limited, he would like to see topos and a house, well and septic locations. T. Yasenchak states that the topos would only need to be for the area where the building envelope is located. Wetlands on the property are discussed. T. Yasenchak states that the 5 years has elapsed since the previous subdivision. She asks how the Board feels since the applicant did have a public hearing when she was before the ZBA. Public hearing is waived. T. Yasenchak states that before taking action, the Board would like to see the additional information regarding the building envelope. B. Duffney states that he believes that there is a gradual slope on this property. J. Cunningham states that it does slope from the paddock area towards the back of the lot and that it is about the same level and land contour as Larkspur Court. C. Baker explains that the DOH will not allow septic systems to be built on a slope of 15% or more.

DISCUSSION

G. Dake asks if anyone would like to share any information they may have from the Saratoga County Planning and Zoning Conference. T. Yasenchak states that she attended the workshop on rural economies and it was very interesting. It was about the wilderness corridor concept, which we have all heard about. Lisa Nagle shared about her work with the Town of Lake Luzerne and how they are looking to redevelop themselves with a certain image. She states that it does not necessarily have anything to do with the Planning Board, but as far as Greenfield as a whole. We do have a comprehensive plan, but if we, as a whole, could have a vision for how we see the Town rather than just as a "suburb of Saratoga" that it is becoming. She feels that would be beneficial for the Town and how we flesh out the comprehensive plan in the next several years. L. Dupouy states that she went to the workshop on comprehensive plans. The presenter was incredibly knowledgeable and we are supposed to look at our plan in one year increments to make sure that the cases that come before the Planning Board, and the Town Board as well, are adhering to our comprehensive plan. One way to gear that is that if we are not laden with too many special use permits. That shows that our plan covers everything, but if you get too many special use permits that is sometimes an indication that you have to look back at your plan. She states that we are coming up on the third year of our comprehensive plan and it is time for a review, according to State statutes. T. Yasenchak states that she agrees with that. In talking about the rural economies, it is talked about how when you review the plan on a regular basis and make sure that you are not getting priced out of your town. If our concept is to be a nice, little township with homes and create the green effect, we don't want to be priced out because people are moving up here who want something else. L. Dupouy states that in talking about trying to improve the signs when you are coming into the Town of Greenfield, other than the little lattice things, and she had made the suggestion that before we do that, she thinks that we need to have the motto or slogan of some sort. In that little blurb, when you come into the Town, it is another part of the expectation. You are welcome to live here, but this is what we are about. T. Siragusa states that that particular session was geared toward avoiding

January 26, 2010

a vision that drives you right out in an unsustainable way so that you are so disconnected that you cannot drive an economy or the reverse would be to create some Aspen-esque type of disaster. The point was made to find one thing about the town, build the town around it and don't worry about the rest. G. Dake suggests that the Board think about, if we have another light meeting agenda, putting on a discussion about a vision, what our total cases were last year for special use permits, subdivisions, etc. He states that suggesting something to the Town Board would be more productive than suggesting that they come up with something. Discussion takes place about the presentation on the foundry in Malta and how that will impact the area. L. Dupouy states that what we have here is really nice and well-educated people want to come to really nice places and they are going to be on our doorstep. What are we going to do about that? Now that this is happening, we should fine-tune the comprehensive plan to see if there is anything we want to say specifically. G. Dake states that he was given a tour of the foundry last week and the gentleman who gave the tour lives in Old Stone Ridge. He likes Greenfield and that suggests that others will gravitate. G. Dake also mentions the project on Route 9 where Farone has already built some condos and plans are in the works for additional construction in the back. This will be a coordinated project with Wilton and Greenfield.

G. Dake states that T. Siragusa and M. Thrailkill gave him recommendations for the Planning Board vacancy. He has spoken to both and encouraged them to submit letters of interest.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland