

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD

October 29, 2019

REGULAR MEETING

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by Tonya Yasenchak at 7:00 p.m. On roll call, the following members are present: Tonya Yasenchak, Charlie Dake, Butch Duffney, Mike Gyarmathy, Robert Roeckle, Nick Querques and Joe Sabanos, alternate. Karla Conway is absent. Mike Waldron, Code Enforcement Officer, and Charlie Baker, Town Engineer, are present. T. Yasenchak states that J. Sabano has full voting privileges for the entirety of the meeting.

MINUTES

Minutes- August 27, 2019

August 27, 2019 minutes will be reviewed at the next meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Jenks, D. Case #631
TM# 150.-1-2.3

15 Wilsey Road
Lot Line Adjustment

Denise and Dale Jenks are present. T. Yasenchak states this project is a lot line adjustment. If it were a simple lot line adjustment it could have been done administratively. This is a little more involved. T. Yasenchak asks M. Waldron if this is in compliance with what the Board has asked for. M. Waldron states yes it is. T. Yasenchak asks C. Baker if he has an issue. C. Baker states that he has no issues. The Board waives the public hearing for this case because the applicant is making the lot bigger.

RESOLUTION – Dale and Denise Jenks

MOTION: Duffney

SECOND: Dake

RESOLVED, that the Town of Greenfield Planning Board grants lot line adjustment approval to Dale and Denise Jenks for property located at 15 Wilsey Road, TM#150.-1-23, per the map submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Roeckle, Yasenchak, Querques, and Sabano

Noes: None

Absent: Conway

NEW BUSINESS

Provost, C. Case #634

Grange Road

TM# 138.-1-42**Minor Subdivision**

Cecil Provost is present and states that he is a realtor, builder and developer in the area. He states that he purchased a 52 acre parcel on Grange Road and is looking to do a 4 lot subdivision. T. Yasenchak asks if there are any structures on the property. C. Provost states no. T. Yasenchak states that there are 3 smaller parcels to the north and a 46.48 acre lot to the south. C. Provost states yes. The front portion, 40% of the land, is high and dry and the rear 60% (+-) is wet. They will not be touching anything near the wetlands. T. Yasenchak asks if the wetlands were delineated or did they take it off the maps. C. Provost states it is from USGS. He believes they are Army Corp. of Engineering. The Board received a letter from the Town Engineer this evening. C. Baker states that site distance was provided on the map. The information that was provided was based on stopping site distance. Typically when the Board looks for site distance they look for intersection site distance. One of the lots (lot 2) does not meet the criteria for intersection site distance. C. Provost asks what the criteria for site distance are. C. Baker states the criteria for intersection is 430'. He wonders if it is possible to move the driveway. Based on the amount of disturbance shown on the plan for the 4 lots is over an acre. The Board will require a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, filing a notice of intent, storm water management report and everything that goes along with that. The Board needs more information regarding the wetlands and where the line actually is. The Board needs something more reassuring. T. Yasenchak asks what his plans for remaining lands are because the Town does not have a 5 year rule anymore, however with SEQRA if this parcel is subdivided again within 5 years the Board will have to revisit it. C. Provost states that he wants to build his house there. R. Roeckle states that his concern is that the lots meet frontage for the size of the lots and they are narrow lots, it limits what could be done on them. C. Provost states that in 5-10 years he is hoping to subdivide for his 3 children. Part of his intention and one of the biggest challenges is affordable housing. By keeping the lots conforming it is giving him the opportunity to build some affordable housing, sell them and make a reasonable profit. This is zoned for 1 and 2 family housing, possibly duplexes. The 46 acres he is going to keep. B. Duffney states that he knows the property well, it is pretty wet and asks if there has been deep hole testing. C. Provost states yes all the information is on the map. B. Duffney states that C. Provost mentioned duplexes. C. Provost states yes, they are zoned for 1 or 2 families. M. Waldron confirms that it is zoned for 1 or 2 families. J. Sabano asks C. Baker if the perk test changes from a 1 family to a 2 family home. Would the limits change? C. Baker states that the board does not generally require a perk test for subdivisions it is required before a building permit. T. Yasenchak states that she would like the wetlands delineated. Also, look at the driveway, possibly have a shared driveway. The Board usually does not like shared driveways. She feels the Board should wait to review SEQRA until the wetlands are delineated. The Board schedules a public hearing for November 12, 2019.

Integrated Staffing Corp. Case #635
TM# 153.13-1-28.1

463 Maple Ave.
Site Plan Review

Peter Yezzi and Kevin Hastings are present. Peter Yezzi owns Integrated Staffing along with his wife. They are looking to do an addition on the building for better work flow. 4 years ago they did the interior and now they are looking to do the outside. T. Yasenchak asks M. Waldron to explain what he provided the Board. M. Waldron states that it is the zoning requirements for the Office Residential District for office use. Also he provided the regulation table. There are 8 parking spaces 2 are for clients. T. Yasenchak asks if they are adding parking spaces. K. Hastings states they have 3 existing parking spaces in the front of the

building for clients and 3 in the back, plus a handicapped parking space. They are looking at 2 additional parking spaces for a total of 8 parking spots. T. Yasenchak asks if the driveway is shared with the property behind the applicants, and is that something the applicants have a deeded easement to? P. Yezzi states yes. T. Yasenchak asks if that can be provided to the Board to have it on record. P. Yezzi states that it came with the property when they bought it. C. Baker states he would like to see an updated letter from the engineer that the septic system is capable of handling the additional clients and staff the applicant is proposing to have. Any proposed lighting that will be on site, whether it is parking lot lighting or building lighting. Also, location for trash removal. P. Yezzi states that they do not have a dumpster. C. Baker states that is fine the Board just wants to know what is on the site. P. Yezzi states they have County Waste as their garbage removal. T. Yasenchak asks if the sign is going to stay the same. P. Yezzi states yes. T. Yasenchak states there is a tree planting detail on the plans. Are there new trees being planted. K. Hastings states at the moment there is no landscaping it is on the plans in case it is requested by the Board. T. Yasenchak asks what the property to the north is. P. Yezzi states that it is King Enterprise. T. Yasenchak asks M. Waldron what the code is for buffer between commercial and commercial. M. Waldron states that he does not. R. Roeckle asks what the addition will look like. K. Hasting shows the Board a conceptual rendering of the building. It is preliminary. T. Yasenchak asks will the main entrance be in the front or the back where the ramp is. P. Yezzi states that it will remain in the front. T. Yasenchak asks if that is something that will be open for the public. P. Yezzi states yes. B. Duffney asks about the additional lighting on the outside. P. Yezzi states that they might do some lighting with the landscaping, but that is still something they are working on. T. Yasenchak states if that is something they are proposing then it needs to be on the plans. B. Duffney asks if there have been any issues with the neighbors. P. Yezzi states unfortunately there was one issue, the neighbors did trespass on their property and they did go through the town court he has a record of it if the Board needs it from a couple years ago. B. Duffney states that neighbors can have incidents, but he is referring to clients. P. Yezzi states that they put a sign up at the end of the driveway that states "no U-Turn Private property". People do respect it. Their clients park in the front. P. Yezzi states that they schedule every interview so it's not like people are showing up all at one time and they are instructed on parking in the front and only employee's park in the back. M. Gyarmathy asks how many employees they have. P. Yezzi states that currently they have 4. M. Gyarmathy asks how many people are working in the building every day. P. Yezzi states that it varies sometimes they have people going out on sales, about 6. M. Gyarmathy asks what normal business hours are. P. Yezzi states 9-5. M. Gyarmathy states that they will be having a light on the back door and front door, which is customary. Does the applicant think that is adequate. P. Yezzi states that he thinks so they are very much a 9-5 business. T. Yasenchak asks for a copy of the deed with easement. Please provide something in writing about where the lighting is going and show it on the building. If they plan on doing landscaping, please provide that on the map as well. The Board would like a copy of the concept plan for the record. K. Hastings asks what size would the Board like. T. Yasenchak states a legible size. The Board sets a public hearing for November 12, 2019.

DISCUSSION

T. Yasenchak states that Goose Hollow was a subdivision that was approved a while ago and they have worked out some details with the Building Department. The applicant is present. M. Waldron states that he has been working with Ted MakKay, Kodiak Construction, and Doug Heller from the LA Group along with Walt Barss and Charlie Baker, EDP, Town Engineer. M. Waldron reads a letter to the Board regarding Goose Hollow. T. Yasenchak states this project is not under any review for the Planning Board, the project owners are just looking to

continue. The mylars had been submitted to the County they were filed and were provided with different tax map numbers and being are taxed accordingly. The owners are just looking to continue and start construction. C. Baker states his only concern is that asphalt plants close in a couple weeks. He is not sure how far along they will allow any road construction to occur at this point. M. Waldron states that he would like to have a meeting with the developer, the contractor, and the highway superintendent, and some reports need to be filed. T. Yasenchak states that all happens on the Town Board level. When M. Waldron states that it is currently under Attorney review, is that the bond? M. Waldron states yes, the bond. C. Baker reviewed and provided a letter of compliance. M. Waldron asked T. MakKay for a financial instrument for the dollar amount that was approved and it is at the Town Attorney's office for review now to be presented to the Town Board for acceptance. T. Yasenchak states that she is glad to see this move forward. M. Gyarmathy states that he would like to thank M. Waldron for all the work he has done on this project and providing the Board with the information. T. Yasenchak states that it is really important as property gets developed that the Board does not lose sight of the process as well as where they are doing construction development, it helps get things done the correct way.

Stewart's Shop's Case #636
TM# 164.1-44

461 Rt. 9N
Site Plan Review

Chuck Marshall is present for the applicant. C. Dake and B. Duffney recuse themselves. C. Marshall states that the Board gave them approval for a 61,250 square feet addition in March of 2019 for dry warehouse on the northern side of the existing facility. That decision was challenged in the development of building plan. In reviewing both the challenge and the approvals they have received it was realized that that large of an addition on that side of their plant would build out the area and not necessarily address some of the cooler space needs that they are seeing (as their as key notes for their food to go). They are proposing a reduction in an overall square footage of addition from 61,250 to 60,000. Technically it is 60,356. It will be a 54,356 square foot addition where the previous one was proposed and 6,000 square foot addition which will be the deli cooler space. The exteriors of both are proposed to match both the buildings that are adjoining. As proposed the 54,000 square foot warehouse addition will be a corrugated metal and the deli cooler will be a smooth metal like a pre-fab panel. T. Yasenchak asks if they are at a net loss of approximately 1250 square feet. C. Marshall states yes. Because they are not doing the bulk of the grading in the northern area the overall reduction in square footage of land disturbance decreases by 8,788 square feet. They will be maintaining the road (it is 38' on the eastern side) and to maintain the 38' it will require a 4' retaining wall. There will also be a storm water re-configuration because of the proposed building. There are existing catch basins in that area and will be re-located north. C. Marshall shows the Board the elevations that are proposed of the eastern side, of the 54,000 square feet and the western side of the 6,000 square feet. There is approximately a 10' height difference between the deli current cooler and the proposed deli cooler. It is an increase in number of pallets high they can stack. Also, what they have done, because noise was such a concern in the previous approval, they won't put any mounted equipment on the taller building. It will all go on the lower roof. It should block some of the noise. He anticipates one of the issues again being noise. He thinks by the public hearing or next submittal, he will be providing a letter from the acoustical consultant that they previously used. He anticipates the letter stating that the 6 decibel max increase will remain as the previous approval would indicate to the same standards. It is a permitted use in the IM Zone. It meets the lot coverage. With the excavation in the northern area the geo-decking will remain the same. They are not looking to do anything different except taking some of the square footage and re-positioning it to a different spot. T.

Yasenchak states it is a modification to the site plan. C. Marshall states yes. T. Yasenchak asks if there has been any change in the back addition besides the size. C. Marshall states no. T. Yasenchak asks if the lighting is all downward facing. C. Marshall states yes it is. Since their last time they have modified all existing site lights to LED fixtures and all of the back-up alarms have been switched to the low decibel for the ambient noise, which was a concern. One of the other benefits in the current configuration, there are 2 loading bays and truck storage, and those go away and the loading bay does go to the western side. (One of the elements to the loading this they are using to shield the noise. It does create a somewhat substantial buffer for the noise that occurs.) The proposed elevation of the building is approximate 30'. One foot higher on the eastern side. 2 spots will be exposed on the higher end, 9' and on the lower end 5'. T. Yasenchak asks what the Town's height restrictions are. C. Marshall states the Town is 50' and they are proposing 30'. T. Yasenchak asks how many new roof mounted units. C. Marshall states he believes 2 on the lower roof. He will confirm that. T. Yasenchak states that she did not think that there were any condensers or any type of mechanicals on the warehouse. C. Marshall states that he thought there was some type of HVAC. He will confirm that. T. Yasenchak states that she believes that the Board reviewed that and she didn't believe that there was any. C. Marshall states because it was only a dry warehouse. He will confirm. T. Yasenchak states that having the condensers on the lower level will be good and help shield the sound. If the acoustic engineer could address that in the letter that would be great. Perhaps the acoustic engineer can recommend a different type of acoustic dampening. M. Gyarmathy states that the site plan is confusing and there has to be a way to differentiate existing buildings and the new plan that they propose. On his plan it is hard to see what is already existing and what is proposed. T. Yasenchak states that possibly hatch the proposed and label the existing. R. Roeckle asks if it would be possible to show what was approved, what is existing, and what is proposed. It would help to see that it is shrinking. R. Roeckle asks how is the new cooler is going to impact the traffic flow. C. Marshall states it prohibits parking where the jersey barriers are currently shown. Other than that it maintains the same width it is 38'. It's all internal traffic. J. Sabano asks if C. Marshall knows how long construction of the dry warehouse and deli cooler will take. C. Marshall states that he assumes 9 months. He does not feel it would be appropriate to phase it. The warehouse will get built then the cooler because of sequencing on site. Then they can shift things around internally throughout the buildings. M. Gyarmathy states that they still need to operate. J. Sabano states they are doing this for prepared food, how will this affect work production. Will they see an increase in personnel? C. Marshall states that it is a 24 hour operation. Loading begins at 7:00 and the trucks go out staggering. Not an increase in personnel. It's just shifting things around. Right now they are taking in half loads of trucks because they are lacking warehouse space. They are thinking there will be an overall reduction. It's not a job generator. T. Yasenchak states that when they did the site visit she was shocked how small the area where they do the food preparation is. J. Sabano asks about the lighting around the building and how it will that affect your neighbors to the east. C. Marshall states that all the existing pole lighting is below the berm. On the entire existing fixtures at the at the warehouse they are LED and downward facing. C. Baker states they will have to update the SWPPP, he understands they are minor revisions. C. Marshall states that he understands. T. Yasenchak states that the Board will need an updated SWPPP. She feels this is not a new application it is a Site Plan modification. C. Marshall states that is correct. The Board asks M. Waldron to write a statement regarding this project. That way the Board will know how to proceed. T. Yasenchak states that she feels it is premature to set a public hearing. Noting that since the Board reviewed this project, before the Board understands what some of the concerns will be so the updated information will address those ahead of time. At that point the Board can have some discussion. The Board completed review on SERQA on the previous approval. Once the Board has that information they will be able to have more discussion about whether or not the Board feels that the impact has lessened or increased. At the next meeting Stewart's

Shop's is on the agenda. The Town Attorney will be present who will help the Board walk through the process of SEQRA review requirements of when SEQRA needs to be reopened or does not have to be reopened, and how to go through that process. It is something that isn't done all the time. R. Roeckle states that when the Board gets around to the public hearing, would it be possible to have the Town Attorney draft up the public hearing notice so that it is made clear this is a modification to the existing approval and it will result in the reduction of square footage. C. Marshall states that it is appropriate to say the applicant previously received approval for X and the applicant currently seeks for X. R. Roeckle states that he feels that the Town Attorney should draft that up. T. Yasenchak states that instead of sending out the typical form letter that states the modification for Site Plan approval, he can help the Board to craft that letter. She feels that would help the Building Department because they are the ones that deal with the public coming in. That notification may help the public and the Building Department answer questions better. C. Marshall states that he is thinking submittal on November 12, 2019 to be on the November 26, 2019 agenda.

DISCUSSION

T. Yasenchak states that regarding the updated bylaws, they don't have to make any changes, the Town already did them and approved them. If the Board could review them and if they have any questions get them to T. Yasenchak and she can approach the Town Board with them.

Meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m. All members in favor.

Respectfully submitted by,

Kimberley McMahon
Planning Board Secretary