

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

November 9, 2010

REGULAR MEETING

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

MINUTES – October 26, 2010

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: T. Siragusa

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of October 26, 2010, with minor corrections.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Siragusa, Streit, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Abstain: Dupouy

PLANNING BOARD CASES

RALPH MACCHIO (Equitable Greenfield, LLC) – Sketch Plan

Locust Grove Road

Charlie Ackerbauer is present for the applicant. He states that the project is comprised of 180 acres of three separate parcels that R. Macchio has purchased. There are significant wetlands and they have been verified by DEC and Army Corps. The zoning is LDR, 6 acre zoning. Some of the property is unusable because of the wetlands and steep slopes. They are looking to cluster the lots as per the Town zoning. They have 30 lots shown on the sketch plan ranging from 1.8 acres on up. This is a preliminary sketch plan and they are looking to get input before working on details. He states that they have done a limited amount of soil testing. It is wooded and they were able to get the backhoe on some of the property. The soils are generally good. There are some areas of bedrock that would limit on-site sewage systems. C. Baker reviews his letter. He states that we are looking at a sketch plan and states that he was unsure if this was being proposed as a cluster. He explains that if there are more than 5 lots of less than 5 acres this would require DOH approval. As Town Engineer he is required to witness the soil borings and he suggests doing those ASAP as the results may have implications on the number of lots and the type of systems. Typically if we see a lot of built up fill systems, the Board would be less inclined to approve. C. Baker states that he did discuss the sketch plan with W. Barss, Highway Superintendent, and a couple of the horizontal curves would not comply with the Town of Greenfield standards if these are roads that they intend to be turned over to the Town. C. Ackerbauer states that it is their intention to turn the roads over. G. Dake states that if this is being proposed as a cluster, a conventional layout is also required. C. Ackerbauer provides a copy of his calculations. G. Dake points out that Jeff Collura's subdivision is the one in front along Locust Grove Road. C. Ackerbauer states that they purchased part of J. Collura's subdivision. He indicates some potential areas for storm water management on the plans. C. Baker states that as we get further along, we are going to want to see a conventional plan that shows a layout to support the number of lots that C. Ackerbauer has computed. C. Ackerbauer states that he understands that 30 will not be the final number. He questions that

November 9, 2010

the Town code allows acreage to be one-quarter of the requirement in a cluster development. T. Yasenchak states that the Code states not less than one-quarter. J. Streit asks for clarification on a cluster development and how the number of lots are determined. G. Dake explains. J. Streit asks if the sketch plan is showing existing stonewalls. C. Ackerbauer states that they are and they would like to keep those. M. Gyarmathy states that he has concerns with the sharp angles in the road at the northern end of the plan. C. Ackerbauer states that originally they were going to come straight into Locust Grove Road but sight distance is an issue there, it is right on the crest of the hill and they are going to do some figures on that. T. Yasenchak states that she agrees with her colleagues. She suggests that the applicant take a look at Shirley Howard's property as there are some naturally occurring water issues on that property as were brought out at the time of J. Collura's subdivision. C. Ackerbauer states that there is a drainage pattern in the wetlands, it drains onto that property and they will try to divert the water into the wetlands. T. Siragusa asks if this will be a single or multi-phase project. C. Ackerbauer states that he believes it will be phased and that they will probably try to develop some of the lots closer to the existing road first. T. Siragusa asks if the lots on the northern section on Locust Grove Road would have their driveways on Locust Grove Road. C. Ackerbauer states that they would be off of the new road because of the sight distance. T. Siragusa asks C. Ackerbauer to speak to the nature of the project a little bit, like what types of houses or maybe a price range. C. Ackerbauer states that he is really not sure but will ask. They will be single-family homes. B. Duffney states that he has concerns about the sight distance at the northern end of the project. He states that in the southern end of the project there are quite a few springs in the side of the hill. On top there is ledge. If they have a few small lots, there may be an issue with contamination with the septic on the side of the hill with these springs because of the natural water coming up. On the top they would have to put in raised systems. C. Ackerbauer states that he is aware of the 4' separation for the Town of Greenfield and they will need to do more soil exploration. He states that they will find areas that will support septic and will put the lots in those locations. B. Duffney states that he would rather see larger lot sizes, 4 or 5 acres, rather than 2-acre lots. He does not have a huge issue with it, but when the new zoning came through we were made to have 6-acre lots. He states that all the wells will probably be in the same aquifer and they might want to consider that as they are setting up their lots. C. Baker states that as they are proposing a major subdivision, it will be required that they drill a certain number of test wells to make sure there is adequate water. B. Duffney questions what will happen with the extra space if this is a cluster. G. Dake states that as we have dealt with clusters over the years, it is a great debate and we will get into that discussion, but frequently the open space ends up getting attached to one person's lot. C. Ackerbauer states that he has spoken with R. Macchio about leaving some space for trails, etc. G. Dake suggests that the new Board members read through the cluster subdivision regulations. A cluster is at the discretion of the Board. For an example, one of the things that makes this a little more attractive from a cluster standpoint, we are dealing with predominately some larger lots as you go up that section of Locust Grove Road. Most of the clustering of small lots, in this plan, is happening on a road back off of the main road so it is a neighborhood not on the main road. He states that you could, and it will depend on how it works from a design standpoint, make it look like all large lots on Locust Grove Road, then narrow down the lots in the back where existing home owners would not notice a change of density. C. Ackerbauer states that they can look at making the lots larger. He questions what the Board would like to see as lot widths. C. Baker reiterates that he would strongly encourage the soil borings because depending on the results, if they find shallow water, rock, etc., his recommendation to the Board most likely would be to not go with the cluster. He states that he does not know, and probably C. Ackerbauer does not know, what they are going to find. C. Ackerbauer states that then their next course of action would be to get access to more of the property and schedule the test borings. C. Baker states that he is saying that he is not sure how much further the applicant can go in their planning not knowing what is going to be found. C. Ackerbauer agrees that it is wasted effort to develop a plan that is not going to work

November 9, 2010

Dave Brennan, attorney, is present for Cellco Partnership, doing business as Verizon Wireless, who has applied for a Site Plan Review to swap out the existing antennas on the existing cell tower on Wilton Road. There is no proposal to change anything on the ground; there is no proposal to change the height of the tower, etc. G. Dake states that the Board did the exact same thing for this applicant about a year or so ago, as all they were doing was an antenna swap. The last time we did the short form SEQRA and waived the public hearing, as there would be no change other than the change of antenna. C. Baker states that he has reviewed the information, they are taking 12 antennas off and putting 12 back on. G. Dake reiterates that there will be no change to the ground pads, etc. Board consensus is that they have no issues. C. Baker states that there is a structural certification and everything that is required. **The Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered “no”. J. Streit makes a motion to check Box B, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impacts. T. Yasenchak seconds the motion. All present in favor.**

RESOLUTION – VERIZON, Site Plan Review

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the public hearing and approves the application of Verizon Wireless for a Site Plan Review for property located at 422 Wilton Road, Tax Map # 126.-1-21.2 per the application submitted.

T. Yasenchak reiterates that this is just for the swapping out of antenna. J. Bokus asks when they plan to have this completed. D. Brennan states before the end of the year.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Siragusa, Streit, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Abstain: Dupouy

TONI HOLBROOK – Minor Subdivision

Locust Grove Road

Toni Holbrook is present for the application. C. Baker has prepared a review letter and a copy is given to the applicant. He states that the DEC wetlands are shown on the map but he is requesting a Jurisdictional Determination that there are no Army Corps wetlands. He asks for clarification on lot 5 and whether the map is simply showing the stonewalls and it will all be part of that one lot. T. Holbrook states that it will be one lot. C. Baker questions the lot to the rear of lot 5, also owned by T. Holbrook, which is landlocked with a deeded right of way through lot 5 and it will continue to be landlocked. T. Holbrook states that is correct. G. Dake recuses himself as he realizes this property abuts his son's property. C. Baker states that his last comment is related to sight distance. He is not sure that there is a sight distance issue here, but he would like to see approximate locations of proposed driveways for the remaining lots. T. Holbrook states that she believes they would be right where the current access drives are now. C. Baker states that those should be shown on the map with the available sight distances. B. Duffney explains on the map for the applicant. C. Baker states that a surveyor can measure the distance, but an engineer should verify that those distances meet the minimum requirement for AASHTO. He states that the surveyor can contact him to answer any questions. J. Streit clarifies that the applicant uses the dirt road to get to her rear lot and that the three hayfields are all part of lot 5. B. Duffney states that he has no problems and that the applicant should take care of the sight distance concerns. J. Streit comments that, it has nothing to do with this property, but that there have been two traffic deaths due to speed in this area. T. Holbrook asks if signs can be put up. C. Baker states that sight distance issues cannot be mitigated with signs. Further discussion takes place regarding the driveways and public hearings. T. Holbrook states that they are buying only lot 5 and wanted to do this as quickly as possible. Discussion takes place that without lots 1, 2, 3 and 4, this would be a natural subdivision and while the Board cannot commit a future Board to a waiver of the 5 year rule, this

November 9, 2010

Board has done that for other applications. T. Holbrook states that G. McKenna had suggested that to her. C. Baker states that the majority of the issues are on the opposite side of the road. T. Yasenchak states that if the applicant wants, she can pursue just the one lot subdivision and pursue the remainder of the issues later. She explains the 5-year rule. The applicant would like to just subdivide lot 5 for now. B. Duffney states that lot 5 must be a buildable lot and that there is buildable area at the southern end. C. Baker concurs and states that the applicant would have to have a map that shows only the one lot being subdivided. R. Rowland explains that the applicant could submit a letter explaining what they would like to do and submit a new map. The fees that have been paid can be held over for the other three lots or reimbursed to the applicant. T. Holbrook asks if C. Baker still wants the Army Corp letter for just lot 5. C. Baker states that he is not as concerned about lot 5 because the applicant is not planning on building and there is plenty of room available.

ZBA REFFERAL

Michael & Carla Alvord – Area Variance - the applicants need an area variance to install an inground pool. No Planning Board implications.

Meeting adjourned 8:03 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary