

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD**

**PLANNING BOARD**

**JULY 28, 2009**

**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: Lorna Dupouy, Michael Ginley Thomas Siragusa, Michael Thraikill, Tonya Yasenchak and Nathan Duffney, Alternate. Gary Dake and John Streit are absent. Gerry McKenna, Zoning Administrator, is absent and Charlie Baker, Town Engineer, is present.

---

**MINUTES – July 14, 2009**

MOTION: T. Siragusa

SECOND: M. Thraikill

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and accepts the minutes of July 14, 2009, as submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Dupouy, Ginley, Siragusa, Thraikill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Dake, Streit

---

**PRESENTATION**

Diane Metz, Community Planning Coordinator for Saratoga Plan, is present to talk about the County's Green Infrastructure Plan, answer some questions and give an overview of what the plan is and how it might be useful to the Planning Board in their day-to-day work. Maria Trabka, Executive Director, is also present. Jason Kemper, Saratoga County Planning Department, was going to try to be here but cannot. D. Metz provides the Board with a copy of the plan and individual packets of information. The plan was adopted by the County Board of Supervisors in November of 2006. The plan was completed by Behan Planning Associates, Dodson Associates and the American Farmland Trust. The main goal of the plan was to balance necessary development and gray infrastructure with the green infrastructure that makes Saratoga County such a wonderful place to live. Recreational trails, natural systems, working landscapes and cultural landscapes were physically inventoried and mapped on the Green Infrastructure Network map. The infrastructure network includes those four components as well as Green Infrastructure Gateways which are sort of a welcome or an orientation to visitors to areas throughout the county. D. Metz explains each of the four components – Farmland Core Areas, Natural Systems "Hubs", Greenway and Trail Corridors, and Heritage Hubs. She states that the plan recommended a number of pilot projects. Most notably for the Town of Greenfield is the Kayaderosseras Creek-Fish Creek Greenway as well as the Mid-County Trail System (Zim Smith, Palmertown Range and Ballston Veterans Memorial Trail). Just because a project is not a recommended pilot project doesn't mean that it is not also still a county priority. There are a number of characteristics that make a project for an area a county priority. Those include; multiple benefits, meaning that they have benefits in more than one category, they might be important for a natural system as well as culture and heritage; either a Federal, State or local priority, and that is evidenced by inclusion in any of the written plans – a comprehensive plan, an open space plan, etc.; any inter-municipal project that shows two or more communities working together; an existing framework for advocacy or implementation, that would be a group that is already available such as Saratoga PLAN; local commitment evidenced by public support; or a significant resource, which can include a rare or endangered species, an area that is exceptionally diverse in

July 28, 2009

species. There is a need for coordinated green infrastructure planning on every level of local government, which means all levels of local government can use the plan in their daily work but also help promote the plan as well. As a Planning Board, D. Metz suggests referring to the plan map when reviewing projects. She asks if the Town of Greenfield has a cluster regulation and states that is a favorite tool for conserving any sort of green infrastructure resource. Another way for the Planning Board to help with these efforts is in making suggestions to the Town Board on ways that current tools can be made better. Some suggestions are in the information packet she provided, Land Conservation Tools & Financing Preservation. This is a draft and she states that they would love input on it. The complete plan is available on line at [behanplanning.com](http://behanplanning.com) but it is not on the County website right now. D. Metz states that she would be happy to come back again at another time after Board members have had the opportunity to review the plan and would be happy to discuss specifics as to how it would be most helpful to the Town of Greenfield Planning Board. T. Siragusa asks if the plan is a goal or if it is something that is actually going to happen because someone has agreed they are going to coordinate and connect the dots. D. Metz states that it is a little bit of both. It is very much a plan and wish list, and it will certainly take each of the municipalities who have been adopting pieces of it and looking at their projects. T. Siragusa asks what is the best way to do it, proactively or wait for projects to come in that happen to fall where that land is being affected by a project that is before us. D. Metz states that as a Planning Board there are constraints. As a Town it would be great to look at it ahead of time and decide what is important. The Town's comprehensive plan did some of that. It would be best to think about this ahead of time, proactively, and identify those projects that might be worthy of State funding, that might be able to be pieced together in some conservation subdivisions, etc., to come up with a whole trail. It might take a long time. T. Siragusa asks where Saratoga PLAN is in the process and how long do they think it will take to do the whole thing. D. Metz states that there is no time line. She reviews what is done on some of the trails. She states that getting a mile or two of a trail is not unusual at all. M. Ginley asks if the trail systems on the map are proposed or completed. D. Metz states that they are planned. The Green Infrastructure Plan is a plan to work towards and that is an interconnected county system that would connect a number of natural systems and heritage hubs. T. Yasenachak states that some are done. D. Metz states that some of the trails have had a lot of work done. T. Yasenachak asks about the signs in Greenfield that say Saratoga PLAN and what they mean. D. Metz states that Saratoga PLAN could own it outright; it could be an open preserve, or not, because of the sensitivity of the property; or it could be a conservation easement. M. Ginley asks if we have a subdivision and the applicant wanted to set some land aside, is that something that Saratoga PLAN would be interested in taking over? D. Metz states that it depends on what the project is and what the conservation values of the land are. M. Ginley states that if Saratoga PLAN could take everything that everyone wanted to give them, it would help to eventually potentially connect the dots. D. Metz states that it could, it would depend on where they were and what the project is. She states that they take the land in fee or in easement. Home Owners' Associations can also own the land or the Town can own open space created in a subdivision and the developer could potentially have a tax incentive to do that, depending on the Town's requirements. D. Metz states that they certainly entertain those discussions. If the Town has projects that come before them that look like there might be something there, Saratoga PLAN would love to talk to developers earlier rather than later to discuss what the real conservation values are and how best to save those. M. Ginley states that most developers don't want to own it, they want to get done with the subdivision and move on. D. Metz states that some town regulations allow developers to retain ownership, but it depends on the town. M. Trabka states that they have done a couple of arrangements with developers, but it has to be substantial enough, have value to Saratoga PLAN and typically come with a stewardship endowment. They take their responsibilities in perpetuity as a conservation organization, so they always have to set aside funds to make sure they can uphold their responsibilities. M. Ginley asks if Saratoga PLAN takes land over if it comes off the tax rolls. D. Metz states that it does as a 501C3. She states that there have been studies that preserved open space actually raises property values. T. Siragusa asks, talking about clusters, if they ask towns to recommend or have some kind of quota system. He states that we have provisions for clusters, he likes them, but he is not sure that we push or recommend them. D. Metz states that it is good to have this tool and it is a good thing to think about first. Not every piece of property is worthy of protection in perpetuity. This is all about balance. In some circumstances it may not be a necessary concern. She thinks that developers actually like the idea, not only for the incentive part of it,

July 28, 2009

but there is a gray infrastructure cost decrease associated with clustering a conservation subdivision. B. Duffney asks if the trail systems go through just public lands or private property? D. Metz states that it depends on how public and private owners feel about it. There is a provision in NYS law that if you allow a trail across your property it makes you exempt from liability, which is usually one of the first things that people are concerned about, but certainly a trail cannot go across private property without specific and express permission from the owner. B. Duffney states that he was wondering because if you have a trail and someone doesn't want to allow a trail to cross their property. D. Metz states that there is presently an issue with that near the Spa State Park.

---

## **PLANNING BOARD CASES**

### **LORRAINE & PAUL VARLEY – Minor Subdivision**

Ballou Road

Lorraine and Stephanie Varley are present. L. Varley explains that this property was originally two separate building lots and they were combined into one deed. They would like to subdivide it so that S. Varley can build there. T. Yasenchak states that the Planning Board cannot act on this application until the applicant receives approvals for lot size variances. M. Ginley questions that there are two lots that were put on one deed and are now one tax map number, so they were combined. L. Varley states that she receives one tax bill. M. Thraikill asks if they are before the ZBA because they are required to have 8 acres per lot. This parcel falls into the KROD. C. Baker states that Zoning will be their biggest battle. T. Yasenchak reads from G. McKenna's notes regarding construction in the KROD.

---

### **ANTHONY VACCARIELLI – Minor Subdivision**

Triple J Way, Route 9N

Anthony Vaccarielli and Paul Male are present for this application. T. Yasenchak reads from G. McKenna's notes stating that he has been in touch with Mike Hill regarding the drainage easements. M. Hill has cautioned against granting any approvals until those easements have been reviewed. P. Male states that the comments that G. McKenna raised last time have been addressed. SEQRA long form is reviewed with a few minor changes to part 1 and completion of part 2. C. Baker states that he did discuss the road bond amount with W. Barss who has agreed to the \$161,000, but that they will be suggesting to the Town Board that there be a provision in the approval of that bond that the Town revisits the amount at some point if the subdivision is not built out in a couple of years.

### **RESOLUTION – Anthony Vaccarielli, SEQRA**

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: T. Siragusa

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board moves to check Box A of the SEQRA stating that a Negative Declaration will be prepared for the application of Anthony Vaccarielli for a minor subdivision of property located on Route 9N, TM# 99.-1-2.11

VOTE: Ayes: Dupouy, Ginley, Siragusa, Thraikill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Dake, Streit

P. Male asks, due to the economic conditions, how long can they wait to post the bond. C. Baker states that they will not get final approval until the bond is posted. An approval is good for 180 days, and then the applicant has 62 days to file it at the County.

---

July 28, 2009

**GREG SLYWKA – Site Plan Review**

Maple Avenue

Greg Slywka, Gary Robinson and Ryan Talbot are present for the application. G. Robinson states that they did make the changes discussed to the plans: the driveway will be labeled with an entrance and exit; there will be no change to the existing sign and a wall-mounted sign will be placed on the building for the beauty salon; the handicapped space has been relocated with 17 remaining spaces, 14 are required. T. Yasenchak asks if the wall-mounted sign will be lit. G. Slywka states that there will just be a light over the top of it. L. Dupouy states that she is impressed with the applicant, that everything that the Board has requested of them has been done. The Board consensus is that everything has been answered. C. Baker states that all of his concerns have been answered.

**RESOLUTION – G. Slywka, Site Plan Review**

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: M. Ginley

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants the application of Greg Slywka for a Site Plan Review for a beauty salon on property located at 462 Maple Avenue, TM#153.13-1-14.

VOTE: Ayes: Dupouy, Ginley, Siragusa, Thraikill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Dake, Streit

---

Meeting adjourned 8:08 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland  
Secretary