

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD**  
**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

**February 2, 2016**

**REGULAR MEETING**

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Zoning Board of Appeals is called to order by Kevin Veitch at 7:30 p.m. On roll call the following members are present: Kevin Veitch, Denise Eskoff, Curt Kolakowski, Laura Sanda, Joseph Szpak and, Andrew Wine, Alternate.

---

**January 5, 2016 MINUTES**

MOTION: D. Eskoff

SECOND: L. Sanda

RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals waives the reading of and accepts the minutes of January 5, 2016.

VOTE: Ayes: Veitch, Eskoff, Kolakowski, Sanda, Szpak

Noes: None

---

**NEW BUSINESS**

**G. DAVID EVANS – Area Variances/Interpretation**

Case #955, Plank Road

The applicant has requested postponement. Board agrees that there is clarification needed.

---

**INTEGRATED STAFFING – Area Variance**

Case # 957, Maple Avenue

Kevin Hastings, Engineer, and Peter and Dhianna Yezzi are present. K. Veitch states that the applicant is requesting an area variance for size of the lot and frontage. K. Hastings states that the Planning Board was very receptive. They did have some concerns as to what might be on the rear of the property. P. Yezzi has investigated and didn't identify anything that appeared to be of concern. D. Eskoff asks if the applicant can supply some photos of the property and adjacent properties from different angles. She did try looking it up on the internet but if they could take some pictures from the ground level, it would be a little easier. K. Hastings states that there is a lot of vegetation and there is also a stockade fence on the south side. J. Szpak questions that the applicant is trying to keep most of that vegetation. K. Hastings states that they plan to do minimal site disturbance including removal of any buffers. D. Eskoff asks that the structure itself is going to stay the same within the footprint. K. Hastings states that there is going to be some demolition to the rear. Mainly they will be residing, repainting, possibly windows, but no expansion. K. Veitch states that one of the other things the Board would like to see is the legal paperwork regarding the easement on the driveway prior to the next meeting, by February 16. K. Hastings states that they are working on a new Planning Board package and they expect that to be done by that time also. J. Szpak questions that the building is 10' from the property line. Discussion takes place and we will confirm with G. McKenna that as the building is pre-existing, that the applicant does not need setback variances. The request is for acreage and frontage. D. Eskoff asks that they are still working on the parking issues that the Planning Board brought up. K. Hastings states that they are taking out one of the parking spaces in the front and sliding the parking area slightly to the north. K. Hastings states that what they have been able to find out was that the lots were created as an estate settlement; they were created based on deeds and not a subdivision.

February 2, 2016

**RESOLUTION – Integrated Staffing, Area Variance**

MOTION: C. Kolakowski

SECOND: D. Eskoff

RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals accepts the application of Integrated Staffing for property located at 463 NYS Route 9 (Maple Avenue), TM#153.13-1-28.1, as submitted and with the additional information requested, and sets a public hearing for March 1, 2016 at 7:30 p.m.

VOTE: Ayes: Veitch, Eskoff, Kolakowski, Sanda, Szpak

Noes: None

---

**OLD BUSINESS**

**JEFF & TINA ZAKRZEWSKI – Area Variance**

Case#954

Jeff & Tina Zakrzewski are present. D. Eskoff states that she wanted to clarify her comment from the last meeting regarding question J. She states that she wants to clarify that the choices were that she would put up a barn to house her horses at night and it says ‘set up day board at local farm’, and D. Eskoff was confused that she wanted the variance to have them there full time or was she limiting herself by that. T. Zakrzewski states to have them there full time, but there are horse farms around that she actually called to see if they could work out boarding. They are not willing to have them on full time, so that is why they are looking to do this and then work out something where she does a day board, takes them during the day and brings them back at night. D. Eskoff states that then the variance the applicant really wants is for full time and that is not really what the application says. She wants to make sure that as the applicants are before the Board, we are looking at the variance that they want – which is 24/7. Applicants concur. D. Eskoff states that this is in an MDR 1 Zone and the code allows a small stable with 5 acres and 175’ of frontage. The applicant has 2.46 acres and 200’ of frontage. She states that the code does vary by section of town and the code change committee would like to look at some of the acreages dealing with horses. She states that we have been advised by professionals that they are looking at about 3 acres for one animal and maybe an additional acre for another animal, but so much of that depends on the actual land and whether it is cleared or uncleared, whether you are going to graze the horses or bring in hay, etc. The applicant is requesting having up to 2 horses on 2.5 acres and D. Eskoff does not have an issue with this. She understands that we need to come down on some of the acreage requirements for people who have horses so that they can take care of them and maintain them on their own property. In some cases, like this you have animals that get older and you can’t board them, it becomes difficult and Greenfield is a very country-natured type community.

A public hearing is opened at 7:47 p.m. Bruce Johnson, North Creek Road, states that he is the adjoining property owner to the north. He and his wife concur that as relatively new residents to Greenfield, one of the things that drove them here was the rural atmosphere very similar to the atmosphere where he grew up outside of Rochester. He and his wife are of the same mind and would support this venture next door to their property. C. Kolakowski asks which lot is theirs. B. Johnson explains that they are to the left (north) and they border the applicants on two sides. Sean Szbunka, North Creek Road, states that he owns the lot on the other side of the applicant and he is also in support. There being no further public comments, this public hearing is closed at 7:50 p.m. J. Szpak asks about the neighbors we didn’t hear from. R. Rowland states that J. Potter and D. Wardell both came in to ask about the project and neither had an issue.

T. Zakrzewski states that she did speak to Patty Older and she was in favor. D. Eskoff asks how many neighbors have horses in the area. T. Zakrzewski states across the street, Older’s and then up the street there are 2 other places. J. Szpak asks what other animals they have. T. Zakrzewski states that they did put chickens on the application but it is not something they are looking to do in the near future. D. Eskoff asks if they are going to put up a run-in shed and a ring. T. Zakrzewski states a small two stall barn and a wooden

February 2, 2016

fence enclosure. No variances are needed for the barn. J. Szpak states that his general feeling is that he likes it when people have animals on their property, when they take care of them. It really bothers him when they don't take care of them. His concern here is not with the applicant, his concern is 2 horses on a small lot in the future with people who don't really take care of them. That being said, he thinks this is a reasonable request and he is in favor of this especially because of the neighbors' support. T. Zakrzewski states that she is a vet tech and she understands the concerns.

**RESOLUTION – J. & T. Zakrzewski, Area Variance**

MOTION: J. Szpak

SECOND: D. Eskoff

RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals grants the application of Jeff and Tina Zakrzewski for an area variance for property located at 407 North Creek Road, TM#150.-1-49, as follows:

- **2.54 acre area variance**

This approval is based on the following criteria:

- **Benefit cannot be achieved by other means**
- **No undesirable change to the character of the neighborhood**
- **The neighbors are supportive**
- **No adverse physical or environmental effects**
- **Difficulty was not self-created**

VOTE: Ayes: Veitch, Eskoff, Kolakowski, Sanda, Szpak

Noes: None

---

**DISCUSSION**

J. Szpak states that he would like to congratulate Kevin Veitch on being appointed chairman to the Zoning Board. K. Veitch states that Andrew Wine is our new alternate.

---

Meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland  
Secretary