

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

November 25, 2014

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: John Bokus, Nathan Duffney, Michael Gyarmathy, Thomas Siragusa, John Streit, Tonya Yasenchak, Stan Weeks and Robert Roeckle, Alternate. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer, is present.

MINUTES – October 28, 2014

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: T. Siragusa

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of October 28, 2014, as submitted.

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

Noes: None

PLANNING BOARD CASES

ROBERT & NANCY DELORENZO – Site Plan Review

Young Road

Nancy DeLorenzo is present and presents a plan from her engineer. She indicates that the plan shows approximately where the septic, well, and house will be placed. She is looking to construct a modular home for farm housing and the property is 89 acres. T. Yasenchak states that this property is located in the LDR district and farm housing is an allowable use with a site plan review. It does need to be on the lot on which the agricultural use is happening. N. DeLorenzo states that it is and she also owns another lot to the right on this property of an additional 12 acres which is also agricultural. There is a lot in the middle which does not belong to her, although she has attempted to purchase it. B. Duffney asks if this is pasture land. N. DeLorenzo states that it is not pasture; they have been haying it and intend to continue to do so. T. Yasenchak asks if they have an employee who currently lives off-site. N. DeLorenzo states that they do. They are in need of someone to be on the property at this point. T. Yasenchak asks if this is being hayed and will continue to be, why put the house in the middle. N. DeLorenzo explains that there is wood land to the left; the roadway comes right in to this location, so the thought was to place the house in this location. There is a knoll in this area, they will be digging into that and the foundation will have doors there. T. Siragusa questions that the numbers on the hand drawn sketch are a little different than the new plan. N. DeLorenzo states that they are because she changed the location and the engineer did a more correct measurement. T. Siragusa questions there is an existing driveway that runs close to the property line. N. DeLorenzo confirms this and states that they are really respectful of the neighbors; they don't even drive the tractors on the road. They actually go up and thru the woods and then down to this area. B. Duffney states that he does not have any questions, he does know the knoll that the applicant is talking about and there should be no issues with wetlands or sight distance. R. Roeckle asks what the agricultural use is and if they have an ag exemption. N. DeLorenzo states that it is a horse farm with 26 horses and they do have an ag exemption. T. Yasenchak asks if there are any other residences on the property. N. DeLorenzo states her own and they have other buildings on the lot. Public hearing is discussed. T. Siragusa states that he is almost always in favor of one

November 25, 2014

but could go without one in this case. S. Weeks states that he is always interested to hear the public comments. B. Duffney states that he sees no use for a public hearing in this case, it is just building another home. R. Roeckle states that he agrees with S. Weeks to have a public hearing. M. Gyarmathy states that he agrees with S. Weeks as well. J. Streit states that he is not in favor of a public hearing. J. Bokus states that he does not see the need for it in this case. T. Yasenchak states that there are some things that need to be added to the plan as far as the list of minimum requirements that need to be on a site plan. She asks C. Baker if he would like to see contours. C. Baker states that in this case it is such a large lot and he thinks it is going to be covered when the applicant goes for a building permit – a plot plan with a septic design and well are required. He states that this is not a subdivision so he is not overly concerned with the meets and bounds as well. T. Yasenchak asks about other items on the list and states her concern for the possibility of setting a precedent unless the motion were to state that items were not required because of the size of the lot. The Board concurs. S. Weeks asks if the property has been surveyed. N. DeLorenzo states that she has not had it surveyed; they have been there 20-plus years. Her husband may have had it surveyed when he purchased it. T. Yasenchak goes over some of the items that are necessary to be on the plans such as the address, tax map number, zoning information, etc. A public hearing is set for December 9, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. N. DeLorenzo expresses a concern for what the public may have to say as this will not be an expensive house. T. Yasenchak states that farm housing is something that is an allowed use with a site plan review and that is what the applicant is doing. The public really can't complain about what that use is because it is allowed. They can come and speak in a public forum; however, the Board's decision can not necessarily be based on that. The Board is looking at how the applicant is meeting the law.

THOMAS MERRILLS, Jr. – Minor Subdivision

North Creek Road

Thomas Merrills, Jr. is present. T. Yasenchak recuses herself as she has worked with the applicant. T. Merrills reviews that he is looking to subdivide one parcel into 3 lots and the center lot was short 13' of frontage. J. Streit states that this was before the Zoning Board and they approved a variance. B. Duffney states that if it has been cleared for the frontage by the Zoning Board, there is plenty of property for the homes to be built as laid out on the plans and he see no other issues. T. Siragusa questions that the driveway on lot 1 is going to remain and lot 3 does not show a driveway. T. Merrills states that the driveway on lot 1 will remain and that there is an area on lot 3 but they had not cut a driveway into it because he wanted to make sure this would be approved. He believes there was a driveway there in the past. M. Gyarmathy states that this looks good, seems pretty straightforward and that there is good sight distance. J. Bokus concurs with M. Gyarmathy. C. Baker states that this is complete – the topo, the 100 year flood plain are on the plans and everything that the Board has asked for. Public hearing is discussed. R. Rowland states that the Board had discussed that the ZBA was holding a public hearing. J. Streit states that we may or may not have a public hearing, it is not obligatory. There was one held by the Zoning Board and no one showed up to make comments. B. Duffney states that even if there had been 2 or 3 people at the ZBA public hearing with interest, then yes, he would suggest to hold the public hearing, but if there was no one to object to what is proposed, he would suggest no public hearing on it. S. Weeks asks what the regulation states, for a minor subdivision are we required or not. J. Streit states no. R. Rowland states that she does not believe that it is required for a minor. T. Siragusa states that in light of no one showing for the ZBA, he is ok with that. The Board concurs. J. Streit states that then, in view of the fact that a public hearing was held by the Zoning Board of Appeals and no one showed up to make comments, the Planning Board would waive the need for a public hearing in this case.

RESOLUTION – T. Merrills, SEQRA

MOTION: T. Siragusa

SECOND: B. Duffney

November 25, 2014

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered “no” and the second box is checked, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impacts for the Minor Subdivision of Thomas Merrills, Jr. for property located at 560 North Creek Road, TM#137.-1-26.2 per the map submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Bokus, Gyarmathy, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yassenchak
Noes: None

R. Roeckle refers to Section 90-9-B, regarding public hearings. T. Yassenchak states that there is another section that states it is at the discretion of the Planning Board.

RESOLUTION – T. Merrills, Jr., Minor Subdivision

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: T. Siragusa

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants the request of Thomas Merrills, Jr. for a Minor Subdivision of property located at 560 North Creek Road, TM#137.-1-26.2 per the map submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Bokus, Gyarmathy, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yassenchak
Noes: None

SKIDMORE COLLEGE – Special Use Permit/Site Plan Review

Compost Facility, Daniels Road

Dan Rodecker, Skidmore, and Rob Fraser, LA Group, are present. T. Yassenchak reviews that the applicant has been before the Board in the past, but it has been over a year so the applicant was asked to come back and refresh the Board on the project. R. Fraser explains that the project was tabled in May of 2013 due to other projects Skidmore was working on. They left off with primarily storm water and increasing the size of the infiltration. In addition to that the Celia’s had questioned a gate and that has been added to the project. D. Rodecker states that this is going to be hidden behind the tree line. They are proposing to use horse manure, yard waste and coffee grinds. They had stated in their operations manual that they would not use food waste and if they decided to do that, they would come back to the Board. R. Fraser concurs that they will be leaving the tree line that will provide screening and there will be minimal grading, if any, for the access road. D. Rodecker states that the access road will be crushed stone with an asphalt pad for the mixing of the materials. The Board had asked for the orientation of the windrows they were looking to do, so they have shown them on the plan. There would be 3 windrows with room in between for turning. As far as traffic, once they bring the material to the site, traffic will be minimal as they will be leaving a tractor at the site. R. Fraser states that they had provided an operations plan to the Board. R. Fraser states that in regard to the storm water, the retention basin has been designed to handle a 100 year storm and he explains the overflow. D. Rodecker states that the gate would be installed 25’ off the road so that they would not create any safety issues with the roadway. Another request had been a sign stating ‘no dumping’. J. Bokus questions that this will be accessed off of Daniels Road near Bloomfield. R. Fraser states it is very close to Bloomfield. T. Siragusa asks the total cubic yards in process at any given time. D. Rodecker states that he can get that information. The site itself is under an acre and the parcel is a 38 acre site. R. Fraser states that in the operations plan, item #4, Composting Site discusses how the materials will be stored. T. Siragusa questions that it states that it will be separated by types of material; does that mean that they won’t get mixed together? D. Rodecker states that they will be separate on the pad and then when put into the windrows they will all be mixed. T. Yassenchak asks what happens once the material is there and has been composted, will there be additional storage if it is not used right away. D. Rodecker states that they do not intend to bring all of the manure produced to this site, they cannot handle that here. A lot of the manure

November 25, 2014

currently gets shipped out by dumpster now. They intend to use the end product on campus for projects. In the winter they probably won't have many projects going on. They would either leave it here and not start another windrow or bring it to Campus and store it there. They currently do some bin composting on Campus and use some of the coffee grounds there. T. Yasenchak asks if there would be another pile for storage other than the rows. D. Rodecker states that everything would be within this facility. Any storage would be on the pad. T. Yasenchak states that there is a concern that because some of it is manure, that there will be runoff running into the ditches and into the storm water basin. She asks how we addressed that. Other applicants have been asked to cover manure so that the rainwater does not cause runoff. M. Gyarmathy states that he believes that the Board was told that a majority of what is coming over from the stables is going to be hay. D. Rodecker states that it will be wood chips. The stables are cleaned daily so the amount of horse waste is minimal, but it will mostly be wood chips. J. Streit states that he understands that the wood chips help to minimize the odor of the manure. D. Rodecker concurs and states that they do clean daily. J. Streit asks if Skidmore has ever maintained a facility like this in the past or is it new. D. Rodecker states that it is new; they have talked about it for a long time. T. Siragusa asks if they are doing a 30 yard dumpster every other day, what percentage of that will now come to this facility. D. Rodecker states that he does not know. Once they build the piles they will shrink pretty rapidly. He states that they are just trying to off-set it and will help with the maintenance on Campus. B. Duffney states that T. Yasenchak had mentioned about being undercover as we have requested for past projects. Part of the composting process is to have water on it. T. Yasenchak states that she realizes that, she was asking about the horse manure part of it. She understands you need to the water and the exposure to the elements but how does that runoff get limited off of the pad. R. Fraser states that it would all be directed into the storm water basin. There are swales within the pad that are designed to direct the flow into the storm water basin. T. Yasenchak questions that then there won't be any elements or particulates that wash off. D. Rodecker states that everything is going to be sloped towards the basin. T. Yasenchak states that then the basin would need to be maintained on a regular basis. C. Baker asks if there is a discharge on the storm water basin and if so to where. R. Fraser states that there is and indicates on the plan, but it is unlikely that it will ever spill into that. C. Baker asks if the pond was designed as an infiltration basin. R. Fraser states that it says detention basin and he will check with the engineer. C. Baker states that he thinks that the point that T. Yasenchak is making is a valid point. If there is going to be a discharge from that basin and it is going to be high in nutrients, then they are going to have to look at the basin and decide how to modify it for the treatment. There are different methods available. He states that he has a copy of the storm water management report dated June 13, 2013 and asks if this is what the applicant wants him to review. R. Fraser states that they need to look at infiltration vs. detention. C. Baker reiterates that there is a concern about the amount of nutrients that may come off the site, so it is the applicant's responsibility to tell the Planning Board how they think they can deal with that. R. Fraser states that the runoff coming off the pad is going into the detention basin and not anywhere else. C. Baker states that a 'detention' basin typically has an outlet. R. Fraser states that it has an outlet, they could change the elevation of the outlet, but it is his understanding that the elevation of the invert is above the 100 year storm elevation. C. Baker explains how a detention basin works. If it is truly designed as a detention basin then the applicant is proposing to discharge water from the site. What he is hearing from the Board, and from an engineering standpoint, if there is a high nutrient level here, that is something that the applicant needs to deal with. He believes that the infiltration basin would be the best option, but you need good soils to be able to do that. There might be better options – that is up to the applicant to look at and decide. S. Weeks questions the direction of the windrows and asks if there is going to be any grinding done at this operation. D. Rodecker states no, any grinding would be done of the yard waste on Campus. B. Duffney comments on the process and that the stone pad will degenerate. D. Rodecker states that they might have to regenerate the stone every couple of years. S. Weeks asks if they are going to screen the material before they use it. D. Rodecker states that he is not sure, it depends on what they use it for, but they do not intend to screen it now. S. Weeks states that if the piles get dry, they might want to consider pumping some of that liquid that they are capturing back up. T. Yasenchak questions that the applicant had said that there would be no lights. D. Rodecker states that everything will happen during daylight hours. T. Yasenchak states that we did have a public hearing on this, there were people who had come out and spoke, and since the applicant is pursuing this, a new public hearing

November 25, 2014

is set for the next meeting, December 9, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. D. Rodecker states that in answer to C. Baker's earlier question, there is probably no need in his reviewing the storm water plan until they make some changes.

DISCUSSION

S. Weeks questions again that there is a section in the code that allows the Planning Board to waive a public hearing. T. Yasenchak states that there is but she will have to check, in the past we have waived it and she will check further.

ZBA REFERRALS

James Mason – the applicant is seeking an area variance to build a lean-to shed roof attached to his garage. No Planning Board issues.

Michael Gyarmathy – T. Yasenchak reviews the application. No Planning Board issues.

DISCUSSION

T. Yasenchak states that everyone has received the additional information submitted by J. Witt along with the comments from CCE. J. Witt would like the Board and the neighbors to come out to the site to look at the information received in relationship to the site. This does have to follow the open meeting laws. It is not something that we can go out and discuss, and it is not for the Planning Board to go out to become the mediator between the applicant and the neighbors. She states that she would prefer that the Planning Board go out on the same day to observe and not discuss the plan. Board discusses visiting the site on December 3, 2014 at 4:00 p.m. The applicant will be notified and asked to have copies of the information present.

Meeting adjourned 8:12 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary