

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

October 11, 2011

REGULAR MEETING

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

MINUTES – September 27, 2011

MOTION: T. Siragusa

SECOND: J. Streit

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of September 27, 2011, as submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Dupouy

NANCY DELORENZO – Special Use Permit

Young Road

Nancy DeLorenzo is present and explains that she would like to have a tax and accounting office in the garage that is currently under construction on her property. T. Yasenchak explains that this is a Type II Home Occupation. A public hearing is opened at 7:03 p.m. There being for public comments, this public hearing is closed at 7:04 p.m.

T. Yasenchak states that at the last meeting the applicant was asked to provide some additional information and that was done. N. DeLorenzo states that she has provided new pictures tonight showing the progress they have made on the construction. T. Siragusa asks if there is a home across the street. N. DeLorenzo states that there is a home on the property across the street but it is set back and owned by R. Eichorst who comes over every day to check on the progress. T. Siragusa questions lights coming out of the driveway at night. N. DeLorenzo states that they should not hit R. Eichorst's house. T. Siragusa states that nothing was provided for the sign. N. DeLorenzo states that she has contacted the person who did the Town Hall sign and he is in the process of drawing something right now. She took pictures of what she wants the sign to look like and he is familiar with the Town Code. Discussion takes place that the applicant will need a building permit for the sign and that it must meet code. T. Siragusa states that at the last meeting the applicant had indicated that there would not be a restroom, but that in the future she could have 2 to 3 employees. N. DeLorenzo states that in the back of the building, because she has radiant heat in the floor, they told her to put the pipes in now because she cannot drill later because of the radiant heat. The pipes are there now and right now it is just going to be a storage closet. The space is prepped for a bathroom. S. Weeks states that he appreciates the additional information, he has driven by and knows that it is tucked away fairly well from the road so he has no concerns. B. Duffney states that the new building is a huge improvement over what was there, it looks nice. T. Yasenchak questions that when the applicant has the opportunity to have employees that those employees have the ability to use a restroom. N. DeLorenzo states that her house is right there. If she has an employee they would use her home. She will get plans and put in

October 11, 2011

an appropriate bathroom eventually. T. Yasenchak states that anything that the applicant does with the bathroom and a septic system would have to go thru G. McKenna.

RESOLUTION – N. DeLorenzo, Special Use Permit

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: T. Siragusa

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants the request of Nancy DeLorenzo for a Special Use Permit for a Type II Home Occupation for property located at 23 Young Road, TM#162.-1-11 per the application submitted.

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

ZBA REFERRALS

D. Myers/A. Manzi – T. Yasenchak reviews G. McKenna’s notes that this is an area variance for a side yard setback for an addition. This is also a Type I Home Occupation, which requires 3 acres. It is pre-existing, non-conforming at ¾ of an acre. C. Baker questions that there will be two homes on the property. R. Rowland explains that the ZBA did discuss that this would also be a Temporary Use Variance as the original home is going to be converted to a studio and will have to have the kitchen dismantled and inspected by G. McKenna. No Planning Board issues.

DISCUSSION

C. Baker states that he has a comment related to the type of plans that have been presented. He understands in the case of the applicant tonight and what they are looking to do that it does not make sense to make her get a survey and a site plan, but there is going to come a point where the town might get challenged by an applicant saying that someone else was not required to do a certain level of detail. He refers to some cases from the past and that we held them to a pretty high level of standard in their plans. He states that the code is very specific regarding details. T. Yasenchak states that the Board has differentiated between home occupations and an actual business, but the code does not differentiate between a home occupation and a business. She states that that might be something that could be outlined differently in the code or she asks C. Baker if with some home occupations they really should be showing the same amount of detail. C. Baker states that maybe we do need some clarification in the code that allows for a different level of detail, but the way it is right now, there is no flexibility. M. Gyarmathy states that he thinks that the whole idea of the home occupation is to give a little bit of flexibility. They are not looking to go out and rent office space and have all that expense. T. Yasenchak states that what C. Baker is saying is that our Site Plan regulations don’t differentiate. T. Yasenchak states that if someone looked at our records, we could say that we treat home occupations different than commercial applications, so we are consistent with that but it is still not consistent with the code. S. Weeks states that we did react with the initial application that came in and said that it was not adequate, and he feels that what she came back with was decent. He is kind of a bug on that himself from the ZBA and we need to ask for specific information. J. Streit states that in this case a previous building is being replaced by a much improved building in which a home occupation will be conducted and he thinks that because it was entirely new construction it somewhat mitigates the requirements a tad. T. Yasenchak states that it does to a degree but if someone were to come in and ask why we were asking them for more information than someone else, we would have to defend that. She states that maybe this is something we look into with the Town Board and ask if for home occupations there be some differentiation. With Type II you do have employees and customers coming in. T. Yasenchak states that she will look into this further and if anyone has any ideas to let her know.

October 11, 2011

Meeting adjourned, 7:24 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary