

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

May 8, 2012

REGULAR MEETING

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by T. Yasenchak at 7:03 p.m. On roll call, the following members are present: Tonya Yasenchak, Michael Gyarmathy, Stan Weeks and John Bokus, Alternate. Nathan Duffney, Lorna Dupouy, Thomas Siragusa, and John Streit are absent. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer, is present.

MINUTES – April 24, 2012

MOTION: M. Gyarmathy

SECOND: J. Bokus

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of April 24, 2012, as submitted

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Gyarmathy, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Duffney, Dupouy, Siragusa, Streit,

Abstain: Weeks

As there were not enough members present to approve the minutes, this motion does not carry and the minutes will be reviewed at the next Planning Board meeting.

JEFFREY COLLURA – Major Subdivision

Locust Grove Road

No one is present for this application.

ZBA REFERRAL

Dennis & Karen Downen – T. Yasenchak reviews that the applicants are seeking an area variance for frontage for property they own which has no frontage but a permanent easement. No Planning Board comments or issues.

Donald Harrison - T. Yasenchak reviews that the applicant is seeking an area variance to build a garage. No Planning Board comments or issues.

Robert & Stacy Cox – The applicants wish to build a garage and require an area variance. No Planning Board comments or issues.

Springforth LLC – T. Yasenchak reviews that the applicant is seeking an area variance for frontage for an agricultural use. She reads from the definition of agricultural use, which includes the sale of products. Her question would be how selling of produce at the site would effect neighbors. R. Rowland states that an adjoining neighbor is using her property in a similar manner. This applicant will be coming before the Planning Board for a Special Use Permit and Site Plan Review. T. Yasenchak states that her concern and question would be how the possible sale of products would affect the adjoining property owners.

May 8, 2012

JEFFREY COLLURA – Major Subdivision
Locust Grove Road

J. Collura has arrived and presents a revised drawing for the Board's input. He has changed the configurations of lots 1 and 2 due to sight distance concerns. This would create one keyhole lot. He is not presenting any engineering as yet. T. Yasenchak states that the Board will need to see verification on sight distance. She states that the Board had asked the applicant about Griffen Road and whether or not it was a town road. J. Collura states that obviously the Town Road is on his property and he is willing to work with the Town to do some kind of lot line adjustment perhaps. He believes that is really a question for the Town Board and not the Planning Board. T. Yasenchak states that she is talking about whether or not the road is substantial enough for the additional traffic. J. Collura states that there was a letter from the Highway Superintendent. J. Collura had asked W. Barss how many additional lots the road could handle without upgrading and the Highway Superintendent stated none. J. Collura asks if that also pertains to Mr. Pulsifer and his three lots, as well as Mr. Aven, which might also be a question for the Town Board as these lots are for sale and perhaps they will not be able to sell those and put a house on them until the road is paved either. T. Yasenchak states that one of the things that the Town reviews when doing a SEQRA, it looks at the municipality, the roads and emergency vehicles, etc. This is something that would have to be addressed before we could go forward. T. Yasenchak states that, to her understanding, there are already lots that are subdivided and exist north of the road. What the applicant is looking at doing is adding additional lots. She does not think that W. Barss' intention was that if someone wants to buy a lot that already exists that the road would have to be updated as much. The lots are existing. She states that is her understanding about adding to the density of the road. J. Collura states that, according to the W. Barss' letter, the road could not withstand one more residence. T. Yasenchak states that we will ask W. Barss to clarify that. She reiterates that those are existing lots and that W. Barss cannot preclude someone from building on an existing lot. When the Planning Board looks at a subdivision, we are looking at the increased density and the increased traffic. J. Collura states that he would like the minutes to indicate that he would like to have the Town Attorney comment on that also. T. Yasenchak states that she will contact W. Barss and the Town Attorney. She states that if J. Collura would like to have his attorney give an opinion on this, he is welcome to do so. J. Collura states that he could also go to the Town Board and present this issue to them also and he could discuss how Griffen Road encroaches on his property. C. Baker states that it is a road by use and this has happened before. The developer usually is willing to work with the Town and give the Town the necessary right-of-way. It can be related to whether or not drainage improvements need to be made, etc. He states that if the road is on someone's property, they cannot do anything to fix it. J. Collura states that they do have room to move the road. He states that it wasn't put in the center of the actual right-of-way. J. Collura states that he wants to get the Board's feeling on the layout and the keyhole lot before he spends money on engineering. He is willing to alter the layout if necessary. T. Yasenchak states that this is the first time we are seeing the revision, so the Board can give a few comments. She states that if the applicant submits prior to the meetings, the Board can give some good questions and comments after having time to review. S. Weeks states that he has no strong objection. The Board did have a concern about sight distance, the applicant had to do something to address that and keyholes are fairly common. He believes that the acreage and frontage requirements in this zone drive the concept. J. Collura states that some of the lots are bigger than the 6-acre requirement and while it looks odd, a lot of the rear is going to remain woods. J. Bokus states that he thinks it is a good resolution to the sight distance issue and there is only one keyhole lot. M. Gyarmathy states that he thinks it is a good resolution as well. He states that we commented the last time on the shape of the lot, but like J. Collura said, all the land in the back is going to stay woods and wild. He likes that idea. T. Yasenchak states that she thinks that she asked the applicant before if he had looked into the idea of doing a conservation subdivision or something where he might make the lots a little more rectangular or even, and then have a conservation area in the back. When you have all these angles, it is really hard for people to tell where their property lines are, and then you get to the back and years down the road, at some point someone is going to put something on someone else's property or something. She states that she knows that the applicant's intent was to give everyone the right area, she totally sees that. She states that it seems really

May 8, 2012

absurd that the lots are going to be really long and go down to 20 or 30 feet at the back that is totally unusable. J. Collura states that it is not useable anyway because of the ACOE wetlands. T. Yasenchak states that she realizes that, but even if you go to where the wetland is, it just seems like it is going to be really hard for people to tell where their property lines are. She suggests that the applicant look into some other options. T. Yasenchak states that one option would be smaller lots and 1 lot gets the larger piece. T. Yasenchak states that she is not sure that a cluster fits. C. Baker states that an option is a cluster, which could have a number of advantages. It could get the access off of Griffen, it could preserve the area, there are a lot of different ways of doing it. J. Collura states that if he moves forward, is there any legal reason he can't do this. He knows that there is a Comprehensive Plan that the Board has to work within also. He states that he has met the requirements of the 6 acres and he understands what T. Yasenchak is saying about the lots getting narrow towards the back. T. Yasenchak states that it would be up to the interpretation of the Board. It would be up to everyone's opinion of what consistent zoning in lots would look like. She states that the rest of the Board might be fine with this and she might even change her mind by the time the applicant comes back. M. Gyarmathy states that there is not a lot of information on the plat. J. Collura states that he did that on purpose. He didn't want to show house locations and septic yet. He states that it meets all the minimum requirements. S. Weeks states that he doesn't disagree with what the applicant said, he does think that the 6 acre lot requirement and the frontage requirement drives us to long, narrow lots. He has a concern about the length and depth of these lots in general. He states that the applicant has fulfilled that as far as he is concerned.

DISCUSSION

T. Yasenchak comments on the additional training information sent to the Board.

T. Yasenchak states that she has some maps from Saratoga PLAN. They would like to try to connect the Zim Smith trail coming up from the south to properties and trails that they have in the north. The space that they are lacking is thru Greenfield. They are going to be bringing that before the Town Council as well as the Planning Board to see if there is anything that we can do to help them with that. There is no action required by the Board. We will put this on the next agenda.

Since we have such a small group and we still don't have plats back from the other subdivisions, we will not look at scheduling site walks tonight.

Meeting adjourned, 7:31 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary