

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

November 13, 2012

REGULAR MEETING

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by T. Yasenchak at 7:01 p.m. On roll call, the following members are present: Tonya Yasenchak, Nathan Duffney, Thomas Siragusa and Stan Weeks. Lorna Dupouy, Michael Gyarmathy, John Streit and John Bokus, Alternate, are absent. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer, is present.

MINUTES – October 30, 2012

MOTION: S. Weeks

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of October 30, 2012, as submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Weeks, Siragusa, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Gyarmathy, Streit, Dupouy

PLANNING BOARD CASES

EVA SARA DAVID LLC – Minor Subdivision

Plank Road

No one is present for this application. T. Yasenchak reviews that this was an approved subdivision, the applicant has now met the contingencies and have received DEC approval, however they are past the 180-day time frame for signature of their plan. C. Baker and T. Yasenchak feel that the contingencies have been met.

RESOLUTION – Eva Sara David LLC

MOTION: T. Siragusa

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants re-approval to Eva Sara David LLC for a minor subdivision for property located at 225 Plank Road, TM#124.-1-51 per the map submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Weeks, Siragusa, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Gyarmathy, Streit, Dupouy

SEQRA is discussed. A negative declaration was made for this application at the time of the original approval. Nothing has changed on this subdivision and the applicants have received their approvals from DEC.

RESOLUTION – Eva Sara David LLC - SEQRA

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: S. Weeks

November 13, 2012

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board reaffirms a Negative Declaration for the minor subdivision of Eva Sara David LLC for property located at 225 Plank Road, TM#124.-1-51.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Weeks, Siragusa, Yasenchak
Noes: None
Absent: Gyarmathy, Streit, Dupouy

GREENFIELD FIRE DISTRICT

So. Greenfield Road

Shows Leary and Mike Chandler are present for the application. S. Leary states that the Fire District is proposing to build a new office building right behind the Greenfield #1 building on South Greenfield Road. They have provided the Board with an updated site plan indicating handicap parking, drainage, etc. He believes that they have all the requirements on the plans. He has spoken to Mike Shaw and Mike Howe who told him that they do not need a non-transient water supply certificate because of the nature of the building. M. Shaw declined to give that to S. Leary in writing, but said he would call G. McKenna that day and resolve it with G. McKenna. R. Rowland states that G. McKenna has not heard from M. Shaw. T. Yasenchak states that this application has been referred to the County Planning Board and we have not heard back from them yet. S. Leary states that he spoke with Cynthia Nick at the County and that she gave him verbal approval.

A public hearing is opened at 7:09 p.m. There being no public comment, we will adjourn this public hearing at 7:10 p.m. until we receive comments from the County.

Board consensus is that the applicants have met what was asked of them and there are no issues. C. Baker concurs. T. Yasenchak asks if C. Baker has received everything he needs regarding runoff, etc., to give the Board a review. C. Baker states that he does. She states that we should be able to make a determination at the next meeting.

SANDRA KILMER

Lake Desolation Road

David Barass, Surveyor, is present for the application and reviews that the applicant would like to subdivide 3 lots off of her parcel and do a lot line adjustment with a parcel to the rear. Due to sight distance restrictions they are proposing a keyhole lot to get the best driveway locations, which the Board looked upon favorably at the last meeting.

A public hearing is opened at 7:13 p.m. There being no public comments, this public hearing is adjourned at 7:14 p.m. as we are awaiting County Planning comments.

T. Yasenchak states that at the last meeting there were questions about the remainder of the parcel. D. Barass states that he has revised the map to show it in its entirety. T. Yasenchak states that she has spoken to G. McKenna and that the Board can look at this as partly a natural subdivision and a minor subdivision because of the natural subdivision. C. Baker states that everything looks good. T. Yasenchak states that we will put this on the next agenda.

November 13, 2012

PETER & ALICIA BEVAN – Minor Subdivision

Allen Road

T. Yasenchak recuses herself. Joe Fuerst, All Points Land Surveying, is present for this application. T. Siragusa states that this is a request for a minor subdivision.

A public hearing is opened at 7:16 p.m. J. Fuerst reviews that the owners are renovating the existing home and seeking to merge two lots and then subdivide the parcel into 4 lots. Only two lots will be for sale and the other lot will be for parents. Sight distance has been reviewed and a letter submitted to C. Baker. J. Fuerst states that the road is very overgrown, the brush is actually hanging over the pavement, and so you really can't see much of anything. To do the sight distances properly you have to be back into the woods and you would be a couple of feet below grade. He states that if the right-of-way were cleared, sight distance would be much better. T. Siragusa reads an e-mail from Charles Yudkoff, Allen Road, stating that he has no objection to the plan as proposed but would like to see the lots remain as close as possible to their current state along the frontage. There being no further public comments, this public hearing is closed at 7:21 p.m.

T. Siragusa asks if J. Fuerst is saying that the sight distances taken as is today, are unacceptable. J. Fuerst explains that especially on lot 4, which is probably the most wooded. He states that if the sight distance is taken as it should be, you are in the woods. C. Baker states that the red markings on J. Fuerst's letter, which has been handed out to the Board, are his comments. J. Fuerst has identified 445' as the required sight distance and C. Baker has verified with DOT that 445' is the correct sight distance for 40 mph. He states that J. Fuerst also identified in a couple of areas that they are just shy of meeting that, 440' as opposed to 445'. C. Baker states that it has always been this Board's position that if there is a sight distance issue and the requirement is not met, the Board has actually turned down some projects because of that. J. Fuerst has stated in his letter that with some improvements, the requirements can be met and C. Baker does not disbelieve that. What C. Baker would like to see is a little bit more explanation of what J. Fuerst would propose to do to improve that sight distance. Show on the plan how much of the right-of-way needs to be cleared, show any vegetation within the site that needs to be cleared so that they can get the 445' of required distance. J. Fuerst states that by the house there is one bush that if they cut that away, it would be fine. C. Baker states that those improvements should be shown right on the subdivision map so that that way everybody is aware that in order for the sight distance to be met, you have to do these improvements to make that happen. He states that if J. Fuerst is talking about clearing in the right-of-way, he is sure that J. Fuerst can talk directly to W. Barss and the Highway Department would help them do that. If there is some additional vegetation that has to be removed back on the private property, C. Baker would like to see a note on the plan or some identification of where that is so that there is a permanent record that shows the improvements that need to be made in order to improve the sight distance. C. Baker states that J. Fuerst referred to the elevation that he took the sight distance measurement from. If there is a particular elevation that they need to meet with a new driveway, C. Baker would like to see that also identified on the plan. C. Baker states that it does sound like they can do some relatively minor improvements to meet the sight distance, but he feels that it is important that there is a permanent description of what it is and what we are improving. J. Fuerst asks if the clearing is something that the Highway Department will do first, so that they can prove the sight distance. C. Baker states that we should probably start with the right-of-way being cleared. J. Fuerst should call W. Barss and tell him that there is a sight distance issue that has been identified and ask if they can put that on the schedule to clear the right-of-way. Once that is done, J. Fuerst can take another look at it and determine whether or not they need to do additional clearing on the private property. C. Baker states that everything else is fine. S. Weeks states that his only issue would be the sight distance issue, as we know that has been an issue on Allen Road before. He states that that is a very curvy road and it helps that the speed limit is 40 mph. He suggests following up on what C. Baker suggested. B. Duffney states that it has grown up quite a bit, C. Baker is right as far as the Town working with the applicant if it is in the right-of-way and he thinks it is a minor issue compared with the other end of Allen Road where a whole bank needed to be moved. T. Siragusa states that G. McKenna's notes indicate that the keyhole is not

November 13, 2012

exactly in keeping with the intent of keyhole lots. Board consensus is that they do not have a problem with the configuration. T. Siragusa asks J. Fuerst if he is ok with the notations that C. Baker is requesting regarding what needs to be cleared in order to make sight distance; placement of the driveways, etc. J. Fuerst states he is, he will check with the Highway Department and keep the Planning Board informed.

GARY LAMOTHE – Minor Subdivision

Canty Road

David Barass and Gary Lamothe are present. D. Barass states that this is not to be a subdivision but a lot line adjustment and he shows this on the preliminary plan that was submitted. He states that he has done the survey and has the map all done. Board has no concerns.

STEWART'S SHOPS

Middle Grove Road

B. Duffney recuses himself. Tom Lewis is present for Stewart's and states that he is not sure that the Planning Board knows that the County Planning Board has a way so that you can get an MOU from the County. R. Rowland states that she is aware and that she discussed the three cases on tonight's agenda with Mike Valentine. He asked that R. Rowland to send them to the County. T. Lewis states that Stewart's is looking to add 800 square feet to the back of the Middle Grove Stewart's Shop. They are running out of new locations so they are trying to make improvements where they can. What this will do is give them more back room and will open up the shop more to allow going in and out more efficiently. They have also been asked to have a kerosene pump. T. Yasenchak asks if there is going to be any other exterior lighting or if they will just be relocated. T. Lewis states that there will be one extra pole light and they will be relocating one exterior light. They will also be improving lighting by using LED lighting, which is all down lit. T. Yasenchak states that this is pretty straightforward, it is a very minimal impact because of the way that the building is situated diagonally from Middle Grove Road, and she does not even know if many people will notice it. T. Lewis states that it will be noticeable on the inside and it will also mean that they have to deliver less. T. Siragusa states that he would be interested to know some of the engineering aspects on the kerosene, are there engineering requirements, and he wouldn't think that because there is additional square footage where any other engineering would need to change because it is based on square footage, or drainage footprint, etc. C. Baker states that the only question he has is where is the existing septic system? S. Weeks states that the septic is indicated on the plans and he never understood why those huge rocks were there. Now he knows they are there to protect the leach field. C. Baker states that he has been to this store many times and he has never seen any issue whatsoever with drainage in there and he cannot believe that with the size of this addition that it is going to require anything additional as far as that is concerned. He states that it certainly does not qualify under the NYS Stormwater guidelines because it is well under an acre of disturbance. He does not have a concern with this. T. Siragusa asks C. Baker if he has anything on the addition of kerosene. C. Baker states that fuel islands and kerosene, all that stuff, are governed by DEC. He does not have a problem with leaving that to them. S. Weeks asks if there is a buried tank in for the kerosene. T. Lewis states that he was told that whatever has to be in is there already, and naturally they do exactly what DEC requires. T. Yasenchak asks if there is anything behind this, just woods. R. Rowland indicates where there are homes. S. Weeks states that there is a ditch behind it and that island is not close to the ditch. T. Yasenchak states that she did not know if there would be any impact with a rear neighbor. She is asking if there is a buffer, are they planning on putting a fence behind it or any fencing around the dumpsters. T. Lewis states that there is always an enclosure around the dumpsters. T. Yasenchak states that the applicant should take a look at the buffer requirements in the code because it is residential behind it and we may need some type of green space. She states that there is not that much there anyway. T. Lewis states

November 13, 2012

that anything that is required, they will take care of. Public hearing is discussed and T. Lewis states that he would prefer that it be December 11th as he has a conflict with another Planning Board.

Meeting adjourned 7:47 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland