

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD

March 28, 2017

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: Stan Weeks, John Bokus, Butch Duffney, Mike Gyarmathy, Thom Sirgusa, John Streit, and Robert Rockel alternate. Charlie Baker the Town Engineer is present. Tonya Yasenchak is absent.

MINUTES- January 31, 2017

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: M. Gyarmathy

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of the January 31, 2017 minutes, with no corrections.

VOTE: Ayes: S. Weeks, John Bokus, B. Duffney, M. Gyarmathy, T. Siragusa, John Streit, and Robert Rockel

Noes: None

PLANNING BOARD CASES

Gary LaMothe—Site Plan Review

Case# 590

John Bokus is requesting himself from this project due to the fact that he is neighbors with Mr. LaMothe. John Cromie is present for the applicant. J. Cromie states that G. LaMothe's wife passed away January 20, 2017 and he would like to bury her on their farm. J. Cromie states that we are asking for a Special Use Permit. There will not be any sidewalks or signs. Mrs. Cromie would be buried far from other residences. This would be a 20x20 private family cemetery. S. Weeks asks if the blue lines are topographical. S. Weeks state that this is his first request for a cemetery. Duffney states that there is another one in town and he believes this not very complicated and should be pretty straight forward. R. Rockel asks if they had a survey done to show the cemetery. J. Cromie states no we were going to put markers such as corner stones. R. Rockel feels that the markers need to be done properly on the property. J. Cromie states that they were planning on using corner stones. R. Rockel states that in years to come the family may not own the property and so he feels it needs to be delineated. J. Cromie states that usually more than one family member will be buried in the cemetery. B. Duffney states that they should have a right away for future access for family members in case the family does not always own the property. T. Sirgusa asks if the Town attorney ever see anything like this. T. Siragusa states that nit is very nice but, he

doesn't have any experience with this and would like his opinion or guidance. M. Gyarmathy states that the survey could be a contingency. J. Streit states that he is fine with this project and he doesn't feel a survey is necessary. C. Baker agrees with T. Siragusa, And R. Rockwell it gives the family rights to access the cemetery and it should be located on a survey, it could be a contingency. S. Weeks ask if they need to survey the whole lot. R. Rockel states how Mrs. La Mothe will be buried will she be in a coffin. B. Duffney states that the Ellsworth family cemetery is on the maps. R. Rockel states that there are 38 cemeteries in town. M. Gyarmathy states that maybe we should call the Town Attorney. S. Weeks asks if they need a full survey. B. Duffney and J. Streit don't feel that a survey is necessary. S. Weeks ask C. Baker what kind of contingency can we do. Baker states that he is not too sure. R. Rockel asks if it would make since to do GPS Location GPS should not change very much with time. C. Baker states that if it's not identified then no. John Streit asks if a deed can be retroactive. R. Rockel states yes it can. J. Cromie states that Mr. LaMothe could file it with the county clerk's office so it would be an easement. J. Street asks if we do vote on this can we vote with a contingency since none of us have personal experience with this. S. Weeks states that four corner stones and a letter. J. Streit feels we should be able to wrap this up tonight. C, Baker states that when checking with the Town Attorney also ask him about SEQRA. S. Weeks states that we are scheduling a public hearing on April 11, 2017 and will vote at that time as well.

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board has set a public hearing for April 11, 2017.

VOTE: Ayes: S. Weeks, B. Duffney, M. Gyarmathy, T. Siragusa, J. Streit, and Robert Rockel

Noes: None

Elizabeth Kirkwood—Site Plan Review

Case# 592

David Barrass is present for the applicant, D. Barrass states that this is a simple boundary adjustment or minor subdivision on Daniels Rd. S. Weeks asks what is the other property. D. Barrass states that it is the applicants daughter's property. S. Weeks asks if this is a simple lot line adjustment. M. Gyarmathy states that he feels it's a simple lot line adjustment and T. Yasenchak and G. McKenna could do that. The Board feels this is a simple lot line adjustment and it can be handled by T. Yasenchak and G. McKenna. S. Weeks asks if this requires a motion. C. Baker states that it does not require a motion.

Corell—Major Subdivision

Case#593

John Streit recused himself. Brett Steenburg present for the applicant. B. Steenburg states that they would like to subdivide six lots, one 15 acres and 5 additional lots all 6 acres each. B. Steenburg states that they are NYS wetlands and 100' buffer. All are on existing road frontage. S. Weeks states that one thing to add to the print minimum frontage and not lot width. The setbacks are 0 to be on it. M. Gyarmathy states that he would like to see a site distance on Locust Grove Rd., driveway locations, proposed septic, well, and home locations. T. Siragusa states that he agrees with M. Gyarmathy and DEC wetlands appears bigger on your map and he hopes that the lot sizes are large enough to find buildable lots. R. Rockel agrees. B. Duffney states that that lots 2 & 3 are pretty low and he would like site distance on all the lots and he feels there are a lot of wetlands on lots 2 & 3. B. Steenburg states that lot 1 is higher. B. Duffney asks if Army Corp. has been there. C. Baker states that he knows the property pretty well and would like Army Corp. and DEC go up there and he would also like delineation and site distance as well. S. Weeks states that T. Yasenchak brought up section 90-16 requires open space and can't be wetlands. B. Steenburg asks how would you do that not in a cluster section. C. Baker states that is new to him he would have to find out. B. Steenburg states that he has never seen that before. C. Baker states that he hasn't either and has to look into it. S. Weeks states that maybe a requirement recreation fee. C. Baker and B. Steenburg agrees. S. Weeks states that the Town has to discuss it he is not sure if there is a set fee and the Town Board has to set the fee. S. Weeks states that they will set a public hearing after receipt of everything.

Collura—Major Subdivision.

Case# 591

David Barrass is present for Jeffrey Collura for a minor subdivision on Griffin and Locust Grove Rd's D. Barrass states that J. Collura has 3-6 acre lots and 1 50 acre lot. D. Barrass states that everything in compliance and buildable and there is little wetlands and it is not near construction. T. Siragusa asks how steep the driveways are. D. Barrass 20' back from road. M. Gyarmathy states that he did a site walk with J. Collura and thinks those 4 lots are the best of the bunch. The Board agrees. C. Baker asks if they did a sight distance. D. Barrass states yes. C. Baker asks for a methodology narrative of the property. S. Weeks Sets a public hearing for April 11, 2017.

Patricia Ford—Special Use Permit

Case# 594

Corina Martino is present for the applicant. C. Martino states that they are planning on converting this building from a residence to a medical office. P. Ford is a psychotherapist. C. Martino states that she knows that 100' of frontage is required but, they only have 50'. C. Martino states that they are planning on changing the building from residential to medical office with six offices in the building. C. Martino states that the lot size frontage is 37.5 C. Martino states that they are going before the ZBA as well. They are purposing a 15 stall parking lot. C. Martino states that she thinks that the requirements for a driveway is 18' and 't the narrowest it will be 12', the parking stall will be 18'x1'and universally it is 24' for a driveway. G. McKenna would like 2' but, it will be an extra 6". C. Martino Asks if they will need a buffer. S. Weeks states along the South side. C. Martino states that she thinks they may need an easement for the driveway. S. Weeks asks if there is already parking on the property. B. Duffney asks if the parking lot going to be paved. C. Martino states yes. B/ Duffney asks about the water runoff. C. Martino states that the septic system was done last year and they will do the infiltrate water system when they do a full map. R. Rockel asks what the use to the property to the north. C. Martino states that it was the old firehouse and thinks that it is now commercial property. R. Rockel asks why the parking space is only 5'. C. Martino states that it must be 8'. R. Rockel asks if they are paving to the property line, and is the septic system large enough for proposed site. C. Martino states it is 995,000 square feet 1890 for the second floor. T. Siragusa asks if there is going to be any lighting outside. C. Martino states whatever is required T. Siragusa asks if there will be a sign. C. Martino states that the client has not made that determination yet. M. Gyarmathy stat6es that his concern is the driveway as well. J. Streit how will you get the cars in and out. B.Duffney asks if the whole property going toi be covered. C. Martino asks for clarification is it building and structures. C Baker states that is it is porous pavement it is still an aggressive use of the property and it depends on the ZBA approval. C. Baker states that it is a limited area of gross space, how will you do snow removal, and water supply system. C. Baker hopes that the ZBA take a real hard look at this project. S. Weeks agrees you are up to see the ZBA then you can decide if you want to come back to the Planning Board. S. Weeks asks if the well location will be slightly under current location. R. Rockel asks if the site plan to the south is easement part of it or not. C. Martino asks if green surface parking space. C. Baker states that that it would not count toward parking spaces.

Lena, J—Minor Subdivision.

Case# 586

Jesse Lena is not present tabled application until April 11, 2017.