

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

October 30, 2012

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, John Streit, Stan Weeks and John Bokus, Alternate. Lorna Dupouy and Thomas Siragusa are absent. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer, is present.

MINUTES – October 9, 2012

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: J. Streit

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of October 9, 2012, as submitted.

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

Noes: None

Abstain: Dupouy, Siragusa

PLANNING BOARD CASES

GARY LAMOTHE – Minor Subdivision

Canty Road

No one is present for this application.

(T. Siragusa arrives at 7:03 p.m.)

GREENFIELD FIRE DISTRICT

So. Greenfield Road

Shows Leary, Jim Clark and Mike Chandler are present for the application. S. Leary states that the District would like to build an office building with the sole purpose of the building being their own office space and storage. They have no intention of renting out any of the space. The new building will be directly behind the existing firehouse. They are not trying to hide it in any way, it just worked out that it will not be visible from the street. The exterior of the building will be very similar to what is there already with a tan-colored siding. Where the existing building has brick along the bottom, the new building will have brown siding that matches the tan siding on top and then a steel roof. The building will contain a number of offices; bathrooms; a large storage area in the basement; a large meeting room similar to the Town's boardroom; a private conference room for the commissioners; an entrance way/foyer that will try to make it welcome and open to the public. There will be handicap parking in front of the building as well as approximately 20 additional parking spots. They have to complete the parking layout. S. Leary provides copies of elevation images for the Board. He states that it blends with the existing building pretty nicely. You will be able to drive around to the rear of the building to access the lower level. All the district records will be stored there. There will be a fire resistant wall that will be built in the cellar to protect the records. There will be a small

October 30, 2012

generator to the rear and a propane tank. A new septic system will be installed for this building; they will not be tying into the existing building except for the water and telecommunications. S. Weeks states that the site plan the Board has indicates a feed to the existing generator. S. Leary states that has changed. T. Yasenchak states that an office building per se is not allowed in this zone, however, public uses are. She reads from the code. This building will not be for rental to the public, it will only be for Fire District use. A site plan review is required, not a special use permit. M. Gyarmathy asks about exterior lighting. S. Leary states that there will be 4 lights on the front, 1 over the backdoor and 1 light on the other side of the building at the exit from the meeting room. J. Clark states that there was no intent to light the site area, just primarily in front of the building for the entrance and the parking spaces. He states that there are also 4 exterior lights on the back of the existing building. T. Siragusa asks if there is going to be more staff. S. Leary states that the current staff will be moved to the new building. J. Clark states that the new building will be large enough for additional staff if that becomes necessary. S. Leary states that this will be a forever building, the District is trying to think into the future. T. Siragusa asks about heating. S. Leary states that it will be propane forced hot air. T. Siragusa comments that they are planning a new septic system. S. Leary states that there will be and it will be on the same slope as the existing septic. J. Clark explains on the plans and states that a new field will be created just north of the existing emergency generator. S. Weeks asks if the new building will have a sprinkler system. S. Leary states that it will not and it is not required. He states that this is a public works building and they are trying to be mindful of the budget. S. Weeks states that most new residences eventually will have them. J. Clark states that one of the biggest problems with sprinkler systems and well systems is the holding tank necessary. B. Duffney states that he does not have any questions and sees no issues. J. Bokus asks if voting will be moved from the existing building. S. Leary states that he is not sure. C. Baker states that he believes that the existing water supply will require DOH approval. If not, then we should get a determination letter from them. He states that the other thing is stormwater drainage. He has spoken to W. Barss about the ongoing issues of drainage here at the intersection. Anything that the Fire District can incorporate with the grading plan to maybe increase the size of the swale that is there, anything that can be done to improve the size of that to handle any additional run off so that we don't add anything to the problem. S. Leary states that they are going to maintain the existing swale and clean it up, they are going to divert it a bit to the west so that they can get the driveway around to the back. Everything is going to head towards the north, which is into the woods. At the front of the building they are going to add about 20 feet of pavement for the parking, which will be crowned so that as much as possible will shed towards that side. He states that at the most a 1/4 will potentially be headed this way. C. Baker asks about a grading and drainage plan. S. Leary states that will be incorporated into the site plan. J. Clark asks if there is a concern that the existing drainage to the north of the building is contributing. C. Baker states that W. Barss had mentioned that he had done some work on the drainage there. We just want to make sure that we don't add anything to what is coming down from there. C. Baker states that it would be nice to see topo and make sure that they will not be impacting anyone else on the back side. S. Leary states that they will make sure they look at that. T. Yasenchak asks if they are going to show parking spaces on the next plan. J. Clark states that he didn't realize that the Board had a different plan and shows the parking along the front on the new building. T. Yasenchak asks if the handicap parking will be in the front and if there will be a ramp. J. Clark states that essentially the front entry will be sloped up to the threshold of the front door, which will be done to accessibility requirements. S. Leary asks if T. Yasenchak is stating that they should have 2 handicap spots. T. Yasenchak states she is not, they should check the regs as it typically states that a certain number of handicap spots are required dependent upon the total number of spots. They should check the code. J. Clark states that essentially this use is being transferred to the new building and there are two handicap spots that are around the entrance for the existing firehouse. He has not done percent of grades and whether that would meet the accessibility requirements of distance and slope, etc. He states that if they need to provide handicap spots to meet the total number required in the code, they certainly will. T. Yasenchak suggests speaking to G. McKenna. She states that she would like to see the handicap spots nearer to this office, as obviously you don't want someone who has accessibility issues to have to go across the parking lot. You want them to be as close as possible. Consensus is that they Board would like to see handicap spots at the new building. T. Yasenchak discusses that all items required on the plan are in the code. Public hearing is discussed and set

October 30, 2012

for November 13th at 7:00 p.m. T. Yasenchak asks about signage. J. Clark states that there will be lettering on the front of the building façade.

SANDRA KILMER

Lake Desolation Road

David Barass, Surveyor, is present for the application. He explains that the applicant would like to subdivide 3 lots. There is enough acreage and frontage for three lots but because of sight distance issues, they are proposing a keyhole lot to avoid sight distance issues at the driveways. They are hoping that the Board will approve the keyhole lot due to the circumstances. There will also be a lot line adjustment with an adjoining parcel owned by the applicant. T. Yasenchak reviews G. McKenna's notes and states that he questioned whether the property is in S. Kilmer's name. D. Barass states that that has not been formally done yet. The deed is still in Jud Kilmer's name, he passed away and they are working on that. T. Yasenchak states that we do need something in writing before we make a formal approval. She questions details regarding the remainder of the lot on the other side of Lake Desolation Road. B. Duffney states that we have done other natural subdivisions without requiring a survey of the remaining lands. T. Yasenchak states that she will check this with G. McKenna to make sure that we have what is needed for when the applicant files the map. B. Duffney states that the land is pretty solid; there should not be issues with septic. T. Siragusa asks the reason for the keyhole lot. D. Barass explains that there is a sight distance issue and two driveways would need to be put in the same location to get the proper sight distance. He explains that there is a low area along the road leading to a hardwood ridge where the building lots would be best located. M. Gyarmathy states that he does not understand the lot line adjustment. If the stonewall is a natural boundary, why did they not incorporate that into the lots. D. Barass states that the applicant is required to have 6 acres per lot and there is more than 18 acres in total on this side, so instead of selling the remaining land, they would prefer to keep it and attach it to the adjoining property that they own. B. Duffney states that there is a nice stand on timber that was thinned and they are most likely keeping it for future timber harvesting. C. Baker states that this looks reasonable and that there should be a turnaround for the fire department on the keyhole lot. Public hearing is discussed and set for November 13th at 7:00 p.m. D. Barass states that regarding surveying the remaining lands; it is a huge very, very irregular piece of property. S. Kilmer had discussed surveying it and it would be very costly. C. Baker states that he believes that they can just file an amended deed and just change the acreage that they are taking off from the other side of the road. T. Yasenchak states that she would be comfortable with that.

STEWART'S SHOPS

Middle Grove Road

No one is present for this application.

PETER & ALICIA BEVAN

Allen Road

T. Yasenchak recuses herself. Joe Feurst, All Points Land Surveying, is present for this application and explains that the applicants currently own two parcels that they are attempting to do a lot line adjustment and subdivision on. They will end up with 4 lots. He states that he is not sure if lot 3 meets the definition of keyhole lot or not. J. Streit states that this is 6 acre zoning and these lots are all in excess. M. Gyarmathy states that he drove up there today and the only thing that he noticed is that there is a little bit of a curve in the road there and he does not know if sight distance is an issue. B. Duffney states that it is kind of clear on the corner, there is not a lot of shrubbery out next to the road. He states that there used to be a mobile home on this property. He states that when he was a kid he worked for W. Williams and pulled out of that

October 30, 2012

driveway. T. Siragusa questions that the reason for the keyhole lot is that there is not enough road frontage. He states that he has no further questions other than the sight distance. Sight distance and driveways are discussed. C. Baker states that sight distance should be shown on the plans for all the lots and he believes that the speed is 55mph. S. Weeks states that his only question at this time is the sight distance so it would be good to have those laid out for sure. B. Duffney states that he does not believe sight distance is going to be a huge issue, but it should be checked. He states that there are no wetlands and the soil is gravelly. S. Weeks asks C. Baker if sight distance depends on what is along the side of the road – trees, shrubs, hedges. C. Baker states that there is a specific way of measuring it from certain locations. There is a defined procedure of how it is measured and that does take into account any trees, etc. That is one of the reasons we ask the applicant to give us this information, because when they measure it and if they find out that there is not enough distance there, they can suggest how to increase that distance. That might require some clearing. B. Duffney states that there was a whole bank that was removed for a subdivision at the other end of Allen Road. Public hearing is discussed and set for November 13th at 7:00 p.m. J. Streit states that we may be able to take action after the public hearing, barring any other issues. B. Duffney states that we should have the sight distance report before we make a decision. C. Baker states that if it does not meet the criteria then the Board should not vote to approve it. J. Feurst asks how much prior to the next meeting the Board would need the sight distance information. C. Baker states that if they want his opinion, then he would need it at least the week before.

Meeting adjourned 8:00 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland