

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

January 29, 2013

REGULAR MEETING

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

MINUTES – January 8, 2013

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: S. Weeks

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of January 8, 2013, as submitted

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

Noes: None

PLANNING BOARD CASES

VICTORIA BENTON – Minor Subdivision

Lester Park Road

Victoria Benton and Bill Van Bunschoten are present. V. Benton states that she previously built a home at this location and would now like to subdivide the property and build a one-story ranch. T. Yasenchak states that the applicant did provide a copy of a survey and has shown a general idea of where she would like the lines to be. We typically do need a little more information on the plans, which a surveyor would show but right now the Board can give her their thoughts and questions. T. Siragusa questions that these will be 1-½ acre minimum lots. He asks where the driveway would be. V. Benton states that she would probably do it right along the “Witt” road going along side the development. She states that she already has approval for the driveway. B. Duffney states that he sees no issues at this point. M. Gyarmathy states that other than that there is more information required, it looks good to him. C. Baker questions that this is MDR1. T. Yasenchak states that it is and without water or sewer it is 1-½ acres. C. Baker states that the only other question he has is sight distance and that the Board will need to see where the driveway is sited because that area is very difficult for sight distance. V. Benton states that she is aware and she is open to suggestions for the best place. T. Yasenchak reviews that certain things are required on the survey – where the proposed lines are, all to scale; showing the setbacks; where the existing house is and making sure that when the new lines are put in the house is still in conformance with the Zoning Laws for the setbacks, etc. We do need to see where the driveway is and because there are some concerns here with the Board, and this is a difficult road, we would also like to see not only where the existing driveway is but where the proposed driveway would be with sight distance. As a minor subdivision, we do not need to have a public hearing on this, T. Yasenchak asks for the Board’s input. The applicant does have to come back, we can’t vote on this so it really doesn’t hurt to have a public hearing. Board consensus is that since the applicant has to come back, it wouldn’t hurt to have a public hearing. T. Yasenchak asks if the applicant knows when they would be able to submit the next set of plans. V. Benton states that she is going to call the surveyor tomorrow and ask him to get started. C. Baker suggests that he would ask the surveyor to look at sight distance first before she spends a lot of money on a subdivision plan, because if she cannot demonstrate that

January 29, 2013

she can meet the sight distance requirements, that could be a major issue. B. Duffney questions that the applicant had stated that the driveway was going to come off Witt's roadway. V. Benton states that it is going to run right along there. The existing driveway is off of Dunham Road. T. Yasenchak states that the applicant is farther away from the turn, that curve. V. Benton states that it is not on Lester Park Road, it is down. T. Yasenchak states that the new driveway will be further away from that curve. V. Benton states that it will run right along it. B. Duffney states that he does not think it will be a huge issue. T. Yasenchak suggests holding off on a public hearing until a better map with the proposed driveway location and sight distance is submitted.

THEODORE MAKKAY – Major Subdivision

Goose Hollow Road

Theodore Makkay and Rob Fraser are present for this application. T. Yasenchak asks if there is anything new that the applicant would like to present before the public hearing is reopened. R. Fraser states that nothing has changed and tonight they hope to obtain preliminary approval and do SEQRA. The public hearing is reopened at 7:10 p.m. and T. Yasenchak asks if there is anyone who would like to present any information that has not already been shared. Denise Jenks, Wilsey Road, states that they have submitted a letter. T. Yasenchak acknowledges that the Board has received it and everyone has a copy. She questions that the plans state that the property cannot be re-subdivided in 5 years. She asks that if that means that in 5 years the larger lots can be re-subdivided. T. Yasenchak states that we have never really seen that happen. C. Baker states that with a cluster subdivision, they would not be able to further subdivide. The number of lots has been determined by the Board. D. Jenks asks if that should be removed from the map. C. Baker states that that note does not need to be on the plans. D. Jenks asks if T. Makkay decides to sell his lot, which goes with the conservation area, does that conservation area stay. T. Yasenchak states that it does, it always will be deeded that way. No one would be able to develop that or subdivide it. D. Jenks states that the applicant did cut some logs off his property recently. T. Yasenchak states that the applicant has the right to do that, just as anyone else has the right to do that. Once it is approved, all the areas that are deemed conservation or no cut, cannot be cut or developed. Dale Jenks asks that the Board go over the paperwork submitted. T. Yasenchak reads the letter from Denise and S. Dale Jenks. She states that she will not read the entire letter from Jarrett Engineers, it is something that all Board members have and it is part of the public record as part of the file. She states that a lot of these are engineering issues and we can listen to them as a Board, but ultimately the review of plans is by our Town Engineer who is in the process of reviewing the plans and will continue to review them so that they will be compliant with not only our codes but DEC and DOH. The first item that H. Jarrett brought up was a question about the 100' no cut buffer wondering why it was necessary along the portion of the project that is set aside for the conservation area. T. Yasenchak states that C. Baker had mentioned that that was something that he had requested clarification on at the last meeting. H. Jarrett's letter suggests that it would be advantageous to provide an additional vegetative buffer along lots 21, 22 and 23 which adjoin the Jenks' property. The third note suggests that the Town change the width of the road from 22' to possibly an 18' travel way with 4' shoulder widths. T. Yasenchak states that that is something that is a non-negotiable item for safety and practicality purposes. We have rules in place as to the width of a road. She states that we have certain town road standards and 18' for this type of road is very narrow. C. Baker states that the road that is being proposed is the Town of Greenfield's rural road standard and that is what the Town adopted for minimum safe requirements for two cars to pass along and provide plenty of area for snow removal in the winter. There is no negotiation or talk about reducing that at this point in time. That is the standard that has been in place for quite some time. T. Yasenchak states that since that is in the Town Code, that it is not a negotiable item from the Board's standpoint, it would have to be something that the Town Board would actually change. The fourth item deals with storm water management. H. Jarrett recommends that each lot be required to manage its own storm water. T. Yasenchak states that DEC gives a developer many different options. C. Baker states that the system that has been designed and proposed by the applicant has been done by a professional engineer who is familiar with DEC guidelines as well as H. Jarrett who is also a PE. There are many different ways when a project is designed

January 29, 2013

to do things. Each individual engineer may have his own ideas about how things are done. What the applicant has presented in both plan form and in their storm water management report goes along with that, complies with the DEC requirements for the infrastructure and storm water management. It might not be exactly the way H. Jarrett has spelled it out here, but there are many different ways to go through and address that. So far, from what C. Baker has looked at on the plans and in the report, he believes that they have complied with the requirements of the DEC. Dale Jenks states yes, but they are asking for the added protection. T. Yasenchak asks C. Baker if something was on each lot would that be additional maintenance required by the Town to maintain. C. Baker states that if it is placed on the individual lots it is the homeowner's responsibility to maintain those, but the problem is that there is no mechanism in place to enforce the homeowners to maintain those. What has been found, since the DEC has put these requirements in place, is that they are requiring a lot of this to be done on individual properties, but there is no mechanism to enforce that and there are issues with that as well as putting them in the Town's right-of-way. If they are in the Town's right-of-way, the town is more apt to take care of it than individual homeowners. Denise Jenks comments on the location of the proposed areas. T. Yasenchak states that there are a lot of issues including topography. C. Baker states that is correct. The placement of these things is usually dictated by the topography of the area, the soils in the area, there are a whole array of things you have to look at when you are designing these things. You have to make sure that the soils are able to handle the water; there is separation from the ground water table so that you are not digging a hole that is going to fill with water all the time. That is the designer's responsibility when they are looking at the property to determine the best areas to manage the storm water. He states that he forgets the number of soil borings that were done on that property, but prior to even putting anything on the map they went out there in the field and dug at least 30 holes throughout the property to determine where the best soils were, where the high water table was, and all of that comes into play when the design is being done. C. Baker states that he is not saying that H. Jarrett is not right, he has looked at the plans but C. Baker does not know if H. Jarrett looked at a copy of the storm water management plan that went along with this. He feels as though the applicant has done a fair job with this. C. Baker states that he is still in the process of doing the detailed review of this but from what he has seen so far, he believes that they have done a fair job of addressing this. Item 5 deals with disturbance limits. T. Yasenchak states that we had discussed that at the last meeting about limits of clearing. Item 6 comments on the NYSDEC SPDES. T. Yasenchak states that that falls into C. Baker's review and right now he is currently in that process. These are things that will continue to be worked out as we go forward. This is the law and the applicant has to comply with that. C. Baker is a licensed professional and the applicant's representative, as a licensed professional, have to both certify that those are met. Number 7 deals with a bond. T. Yasenchak states that we did talk at the last meeting that we do require bonds for not just the road, but for the infrastructure that is put in. It is something that we do not review at this time. As we go through the process, that is something that before even a final decision can be made on the project, that bond has to go through an approval process with the Town Board, the Town Attorney and the Town Engineer. The last item deals with monitoring of water quality. C. Baker states that it could be requested, it would be cumbersome. Dale Jenks states that they will do it themselves. T. Yasenchak states that as far as the storm water pollution prevention plan that an applicant has to provide, part of it is that the applicant does have to do inspections during construction. This is something that DEC requires paperwork to be available. Everything that is in the SWPPP has to be attended to during construction and if something is not then DEC can fine the applicant, etc. June Banning, Russell Road, states that she is concerned about pollution from the septic because she is at the bottom of the hill. R. Fraser explains that 84 acres will be developed, there are 154 total acres and there are areas including the road. He states that there are State DOH and DEC guidelines that are in place that they must follow, they do not have a choice. They have to design the project, as C. Baker said, in order to prove that no more runoff during existing conditions happens after the project is finished. No more water leaves the site than currently hits the site. J. Banning states that another issue is the wells and when were those tested for. R. Fraser states that they have 3 test wells that they had to provide and the DOH is currently reviewing those results. Hopefully by the time they are here again we will have those results. J. Banning states that her hope would be that they could drop the total lots to a lot less. There being no further public comments, this public hearing is closed at 7:34 p.m.

January 29, 2013

T. Yasenchak asks R. Fraser if he would like to comment on the letters, C. Baker did a good job of explaining DEC and the standards that the applicant is bound to. R. Fraser states that he understands what he needs to do. T. Yasenchak asks if there was a reason behind the choice made as far as the storm water runoff to have the larger basins versus something on every individual lot. C. Baker did state that DEC gives options, so the applicant has many options. R. Fraser states that they chose the options that were most applicable to the topography and the soils and the existing conditions that would work best for this applicant to achieve the parameters that DEC sets for us. T. Siragusa would like the applicant to address the tree buffering that the Jenks are requesting. T. Siragusa states that some things are dictated by DEC and others can be approached in a couple of different ways. R. Fraser states that he will speak to T. Makkay about that and maybe at the next meeting go into that a little further. S. Weeks states that he has nothing but we have a lot of discussion about what this no cut means and there is going to be some other language, which is to be provided. We are looking to the Town Engineer to look this over carefully and talk about storm water management. We know that things like septic systems have to be done to an engineering design. Water is always interesting as to how much water you get out of a well, how deep you go and know that there are no guarantees there. T. Yasenchak asks about the utility easement. She asks if the applicant has information about how wide that area is now that is actually cut. R. Fraser states that he can scale it. T. Yasenchak states that that is something that they could bring back because it would help to visualize. You can see the no cut buffer and where the utility comes through, but the actual width would be helpful. The plans are reviewed and T. Yasenchak states that if you look at page L3, the grading plan, it shows where the house would be and you can see the topo. She asks if the applicant can let the Board know by looking at where the clearing is to the back of the property, what that dimension is. She asks how far the utility easement is to the back property line. It appears that that open space is currently in the no cut buffer. Board begins SEQRA review and C. Baker suggests that in the description of the action, 'residential cluster subdivision' should be added to the first line of the description on page 2. S. Weeks asks if the water table (pg. 3) is really that high in that location. C. Baker states that yes in some areas; there are wetlands on the site. S. Weeks asks if this is an average number. C. Baker states that it is a general description. T. Siragusa asks if this includes the whole area including the wetlands, there is no distinction between the developed area versus the wetland area. C. Baker states that it is the whole property. T. Yasenchak states that in the appendix it lists all the test pits and what the water table was. T. Siragusa questions that the acreage to be developed initially is only 3 acres. R. Fraser states that initially that will be the road. T. Yasenchak explains that the area of the road that would be disturbed initially would be 3 acres and then ultimately the 19.9 acres, which includes the area with the houses. It does not necessarily mean the area of clearances on each site. T. Yasenchak asks how the applicant came up with the answer of 17 ¼ to the maximum vehicular trips generated per hour or if that is listed in the appendix. R. Fraser states that he cannot without the formula in front of him and he does not believe that it is in the appendix. Regarding the dimensions of the largest proposed structure, T. Yasenchak states that the applicant has 40' but the Code maximum is 35'. She asks that this be revised to comply. T. Yasenchak asks R. Fraser to explain how they came up with 20 acres for the number of acres of vegetation to be removed from the site. R. Fraser states that clearing for the road and the houses. Regarding question 5, will any mature forest be removed, the applicant has answered no and T. Yasenchak asks if that is true. B. Duffney states that that was all farmland at one time and if there are a couple of trees there that are 100 years old, they would be lucky. He states that the average trees around this area would be 60 to 80 years old. T. Yasenchak asks R. Fraser to clarify regarding the phases. R. Fraser states that the first phase will include developing the subdivision road and the associated storm water devices. The second phase will include extending the road and developing the property. C. Baker states that approval from the Town Board will also be required for question #25. T. Yasenchak states that for question 3 in section C, the applicant had submitted a conventional subdivision plan showing that 27 lots could be developed on this property with the correct number of acres and that was something that was reviewed by the Town Engineer, however, the applicant is not going with 27 lots. Impact on Water – C. Baker suggests checking the box for small to moderate for the question dealing with a protected water body and the justification is because the site has been designed to avoid the filling of wetlands and designed around the wetlands using a cluster subdivision. T. Yasenchak explains that the Town of Greenfield has a stricter requirement on septic systems than the Department of Health has. DOH only requires a 2' separation from the bottom of the septic system to

January 29, 2013

groundwater and the Town of Greenfield requires 4' from the bottom of a septic system to the high water table. J. Streit states that he feels that the question regarding public controversy should be answered with a no as he feels that all of the public's concerns are satisfactorily met by State and local regulations. Discussion takes place that because there was public concern that 'yes' should be indicated. C. Baker states that this is the proper way to do it. If the answer is checked as a 'yes', you really should have some discussion as to the fact that you have gone through the process; you have heard the public and you if you feel whether or not the project has addressed the issues or they will be addressed. The Board does feel that the neighbor's have concerns, but that the Board has to the best of their ability covered those concerns through all the requirements. T. Yasenchak reiterates that the Board will be checking yes, that there is public controversy. As far as reviewing this plan, the applicant has given the Board a SWPPP and is in the process of fine-tuning the storm water runoff. We do have an engineer who is working on that review and everything that will be in this application, and continuing to be reviewed, will be to the NYS standards whether DOH or DEC, which have stricter guidelines than the Town to mitigate and to reduce potential for environmental impacts.

RESOLUTION – T. Makkay, SEORA

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: S. Weeks

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board completes review of the Full Environmental Assessment Form, and moves to check box A indicating that this project will not result in any large or important impacts for the Major Subdivision of Theodore Makkay for property located at 60 Goose Hollow Road, TM#150.-2-2.

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

Noes: None

T. Yasenchak states that the next step would be to act on preliminary design approval. She asks C. Baker if there is anything else that needs to be done at this point. Typically the Board would act on a preliminary review so that the applicant knows whether they need to be changing something at this point significantly before going ahead and continuing with the design and C. Baker's review. C. Baker concurs and states that it gives the applicant a level of comfort that they have a viable project and that it is just a matter of going through the detail and design phase, posting the road bond, etc. C. Baker states that if the Board chooses to grant preliminary approval that it be contingent upon satisfaction of DOH, DEC, Town Engineer and Town Board review.

RESOLUTION – T. Makkay, Major Subdivision – Preliminary Approval

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants preliminary approval to the Major Subdivision of Theodore Makkay for property located at 60 Goose Hollow Road, TM#150.-2-2, contingent upon:

- **Final review and approval by Department of Health, DEC, Town Engineer, Town Board, Town Counsel and any other reviewing agencies**

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

Noes: None

January 29, 2013

MICHAEL SPIAK – Special Use Permit
Grange Road

Michael Spiak is present. T. Yasenchak states that this application is for the expansion of a Special Use Permit. M. Spiak explains that in 2005 Martha Carver put a conservation easement on the property and in the spirit of that, in 2007 M. Spiak received a special use permit for agricultural activities on that property. The one thing that they choose to do was to plant vineyards, which they have and the vineyards have thrived. He states that he made it clear in 2007 that they were planting wine grapes so he had every intention of producing wine as the agricultural product. He is at the stage now that the vineyards have matured and they are ready to make wine. He states that one of the stipulations through the TTB (Tax and Trade Bureau) is that he gets permission from the Town so that he can get a license. He also needs a structure so they are planning on putting up a barn, a simple pole barn. It is quite a way back, but will be visible from Grange Road. This will strictly be a wine-making facility; it will not be a tasting room. They will come back at a later date for the tasting room. M. Spiak states that he is also in the middle of trying to get an agricultural assessment on this. A public hearing is opened at 8:53 p.m. Lynn Baker, Grange Road, states that she thinks it is a great idea and would like to see the wine tasting room. Chris Baker, Grange Road, states that he thinks that Mike and Kelly Spiak have done a wonderful job, they have done some really nice things, it's a good project on it's way to being a real asset to the Town of Greenfield. He commends M. Spiak for his hard work and his diligence, because it is farming. T. Siragusa asks how the Board feels about a master plan and would the public like to see that. T. Yasenchak states that if a master plan were provided now, the Board would not be voting on the entire master plan but would see where the project is going. J. Streit asks the applicant that at the last meeting he stated he would be putting up this barn and that in the future he would see a tasting room and a sign. He asks if the applicant sees anything beyond that scope that would be in a master plan. Applicant states that he would do a master plan for a tasting room, but right now it's just a barn. When it comes time for the tasting room he absolutely plans on doing the master plan unless the Board feels that they need one for the barn. M. Gyarmathy states that he thinks that at this point the applicant is developing something that is a wonderful thing, but it could grow. He thinks at this point we should see a master plan. There is parking, future construction, public facilities – all these things have to be taken into consideration. M. Spiak states that when the tasting room comes in, all those things will come into play, but he does not plan on having that for 2 or 3 years. M. Gyarmathy states that he thinks that the Town needs to know where the applicant is going with this and the only way we are going to know that is with a master plan. J. Streit states that he does not disagree, but that at this point what the applicant is talking about is the one barn and these other things would be 2 or 3 years down the road. The only thing that the Town should be concerned with beyond the building of this barn, which he is talking about right now, is the future implementation of the tasting room, parking and so forth, at which time he can present his master plan, which would then be the appropriate time for the public to have its review. M. Gyarmathy states that he agrees with Dr. Streit, but everyone else who comes before the Board we ask for a master plan. We don't mind them having phases of the plan, but he thinks that we need to see the big picture. B. Duffney states that right now the applicant is looking to build a barn to squeeze grapes. He feels that it would be like him building a barn to put his sawmill in. At this point it is a barn for the grapes and he refers to G. McKenna's notes that he agrees with C. Baker that a master plan is a good idea as future construction, parking locations, etc. should be addressed. B. Duffney states that it is only a barn now the make the wine. Before he proceeds any farther, he needs to come in with a master plan. T. Siragusa states that that is not what segmentation is. J. Streit states that his personal interpretation is that it is compatible with the spirit of what G. McKenna is saying. J. Bokus asks the applicant about a timeframe before he has enough product. M. Spiak states that it would probably be 2 to 3 seasons before he could get enough inventory before he could do anything. He states that by 2015 he plans to have bottle to put on a shelf. One of the things that they are not sure of is exactly where they want to put the tasting room. There are several options on the property. They haven't really decided that yet. A little more study needs to go into that. T. Siragusa asks what the effort would be that would be involved. Can this be done in a sketch, does the applicant need to hire an engineer, etc. C. Baker states that we have seen various things. It is spelled out in the Town code what is typically required to be shown. B. Duffney asks if the applicant has to go before the Town Board. C. Baker states not unless the applicant is

January 29, 2013

looking for a PUD. S. Weeks states that he can look at this in two different ways dealing with agriculture a lot. One is if some just came in and said they wanted to build a barn, that would be a fairly straightforward thing. As the applicant talks more about what his future plans are, then we say, we would like to know more about that. In agriculture, he is used to someone just building a barn and that's it. They may have other things in their mind about what they are going to do, but they are not required at that point to say that '3 years down the road I am going to do this and this'. He states that he is pretty sympathetic to people in agriculture wanting to do something like this and he is saying that when they get to the next phase that it has to be very clear that you have to do more. Obviously the applicant should have something in his mind now about where he wants to go. He would not insist that he has to see something on paper right at this point, but he sure would for any next phase. J. Streit states that he feels that S. Weeks voices his (J. Streit's) opinion very well. He does not believe that violates the spirit of any regulations that we have that if he comes to the next phase that he has to provide the master plan. Right now if we ask him, he doesn't know what the best plan would be. M. Gyarmathy states that he is not asking that the applicant write a plan in stone, he would just like some idea. T. Siragusa states that the Board's job is to help inform the public of what we know about potential projects, regardless of what our emotional or sentiment is. He states that he feels conflicted because it is not a big deal and he does not expect the tasting room to be a big deal, but he feels we should have something on the record to be able to say that this is the project. T. Yasenchak states she looks at this, on one hand, as just purely an agricultural processing building and no different than someone who is going to have chickens and maybe package the eggs. On the other hand, she does want to know where it is going. For her where the line is, if we start getting a master plan now, she does not want to give the applicant any idea that just because we give him a special use permit now for this building, there are no promises as to what a future decision would be. She is worried that if we get a master plan now showing his future uses and we are just voting on his building, she does not want to give the applicant the thought that he is now ok, we have given approval and we are fine with it. We don't know who is going to be here next year or two or three years from now. We cannot make a decision for that Board. So unless we get the whole thing now, if the applicant knew right now exactly what they were doing and the Board were giving approval for the whole thing, site plan approval and special use permit for the whole thing, she would feel more comfortable asking for the master plan. She does not feel comfortable asking for it because she feels it puts the Board in a precarious place later by asking for the master plan and then later asking for the applicant to do more work. If right now all we do is approve this one barn, it is putting the risk on the applicant of knowing that he may or may not be able to do the tasting room in 2 or 3 years. B. Duffney asks the applicant if there is the possibility that he might not have the tasting room on this property. M. Spiak states that there is the possibility. The other option that they are looking at is putting one up downtown, possibly somewhere in Saratoga. He is not sure if they would get enough customers here in Greenfield. That is one option. B. Duffney states that at this time then the master plan may not suit the applicant's needs until they decide if they are going to put the tasting room at this property. The applicant may just put more vineyards in and just use the barn for processing. T. Siragusa states that he is not against this, it sounds great to him. When we have had other applicants, including someone right down the road, we asked that applicant to put every idea on a map that might happen, not will happen, but might happen so that in the public record there is a design for anything that might happen whether in one year or two years or 16 years. He thinks that what he is asking for is consideration of that consistency. There is no disagreement that it may or may not happen, or that he just wants a barn, etc. It is about intent and that is the consistency, that we have always asked other applicants to put everything that they know that they might do on a plan. T. Yasenchak questions that we have asked people to do that for a PUD or for a special use permit. T. Siragusa states that the applicant he has in mind was for a PUD. C. Baker states that you have to do that for a PUD because you are asking for a zoning change and you have to identify everything that you want to do there. B. Duffney states that since M. Mulholland took over the old Loeffler's saw mill, they have come in at different times for different things. C. Baker asks if there is a plan to expand the vineyards on this property. M. Spiak states yes, and explains on the map. He states that they are classified as a micro winery and they are only applying for the small farm winery license. There are a lot of restrictions on it. C. Baker asks what they do for water and irrigation. He states that he is not familiar with growing grapes. M. Spiak states that when he first started, Cornell University got involved because he was talking about putting some of their vines in there and he talked to

January 29, 2013

them about irrigation. He states that he has not irrigated at all and the vines have done perfectly fine. S. Weeks reads from the application that the applicant is requesting only building a barn with no tasting room, store or parking places necessary. He states that as an agricultural guy, he says that if someone wants to build a barn - good for him; he is growing grapes – good for him; we have agriculture in Greenfield – good for him. That is what he asked for. J. Streit states that as it makes good sense to have a master plan for some of these more complicated buildings and business, that is not applicable to the current applicant and he does not see a second winery coming in saying that this applicant didn't have to do it so they don't have to do it. An informal poll of the Board is taken and the consensus is that the Board will not be asking the applicant for a master plan (Bokus, Duffney, Streit, Weeks & Yasenchak in favor of not asking for; Gyarmathy & Siragusa in favor of asking for). There being no further public comments, this public hearing is closed at 9:18 p.m.

RESOLUTION – M. Spiak, Expansion of Special Use Permit

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: T. Siragusa

RESOLVED that the Planning Board grants an expansion of a Special Use Permit to Mike Spiak for property located at 331 Grange Road, TM#151.-2-59.1, as follows:

- **To build a barn as per the manner that is described in his application**

This approval is contingent upon:

- **The understanding that should the applicant decide the expand this in any way in the future with uses, construction of buildings, etc. the applicant has to submit a master plan**

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

Noes: None

DISCUSSION

C. Baker states that regarding Casey Cornell's Humes Road subdivision, W. Barss, C. Cornell, G. Robinson and C. Baker met to discuss the intersection modifications that they are interested in doing. The general consensus and agreement was that the applicant is going to file the application with DEC to show that realignment that W. Barss would like to do with the road. Assuming that DEC issues the permit and are ok with it, then W. Barss is going to proceed with doing that portion of the work only. Then we will work on all the rest of the details with the road as the project moves forward. T. Yasenchak states that that is the Town's intersection so he can do that. Any continued development up the road is something that will be worked out. C. Baker states that W. Barss may be doing some clearing of the right away and he has the ability to do that, it is within his purview.

Meeting adjourned 9:21 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorraine Fiorino