

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

March 7, 2017

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 member are present: Kevin Veitch, Denise Eskoff, Curt Kolakowski, Laura Sanda, Joe Szpak. Andrew Wine, Alternate, is absent.

February 7, 2017 MINUTES

MOTION: Eskoff

SECOND: Veitch

RESOLVED: The Zoning Board of Appeals waives the reading of and accepts the of February 7, 2017 with minor corrections.

VOTES: Ayes: K. Veitch, D. Eskoff, L. Sanda

Noes: None

Abstain: C. Kolakowski, J. Szpak

NEW BUSINESS

**Cochran, D. Case# 978
342 Lake Desolation Rd.**

Area Variance

Applicant is requesting an area variance. Daniel Cochran is present for the application. K. Veitch explains the process. K. Veitch asks if D. Cochran can explain we have one property not two. D. Cochran states there are two. K. Veitch states that we need two (2) applications one for each property.

MOTION: J. Szpak
SECOND: C. Kolakowski

Votes: Ayes: K. Veitch, D. Eskoff, L. Sanda, J. Szpak, C. Kolakowski
Noes: None

RESOLUTION: Daniel Cochran Area Variance

RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals accepts the application for Case # 978 Daniel Cochran, for an area variance contingent upon receipt of another application for the second property that must be submitted two weeks prior to the April 4, 2017 meeting*. (*Pending – Public Hearing date April 2017 meeting.)

**Derek Zeh Case# 979
Bump Hill Rd.**

Area Variance

Applicant is requesting an area variance. Derek Zeh is present for the application. K. Veitch explains the process. D. Eskoff asks when was his house completed 2016, and the variance was granted 2015. J. Szpak asks if they own the lot behind theirs and if they do is that big enough or not practical area for the pool. D. Zeh states that the pool contractor suggested that he's showing it closer to the property line to allow room for error. D. Zeh states that it is seventeen feet but it looks to be five feet closer to the house. D. Zeh states that they do own their home. D. Eskoff asks if they combined the property behind them last when they built their home. D. Zeh states that they did not combine the property when they built the home. D. Eskoff states that the application looks complete. L. Sanda requests pictures. J. Szpak asks if there are any trees. K. Veitch asks for pictures of neighboring properties.

MOTION: J. Szpak
SECOND: L. Sanda

Votes: Ayes: K. Veitch, D. Eskoff, L. Sanda, J. Szpak, C. Kolakowski
Noes: None

RESOLUTION: Derek Zeh Area Variance

RESOLVED, that The Zoning Board of Appeals accepts the application for case # 979 of Derek Zeh, for an area variance contingent upon showing that they own the property behind theirs and submit pictures of neighboring properties and accurate setbacks to the ZBA by March 21, 2017.

OLD BUSINESS

**Royal Rhino Owner, LLC
Case # 974**

**Area Variance
NYS Route 9N**

K. Perrotte is present for the applicant. K. Veitch asks if K. Perrotte has numbers for us. K. Perrotte states he did not get ahold of Fast Signs. L. Sanda states that it was determined that by sign measurements that the sign is less than 30x50 square feet. D. Eskoff states that it would be helpful to have the exact measurements from Fast signs. If they are less than thirty square feet we don't need to issue you a variance for that. D. Eskoff asks are the signs in the right away. K. Veitch states that in the Town of Greenfield we don't allow two separate signs. J. Szpak is in favor of two signs. D. Eskoff states that she is not opposed of the two signs back to back. D. Eskoff asks how long has the park been there. K. Veitch asks are there street names on the northern end. K. Perrotte states no. J. Szpak asks how the signs should be put. L. Sanda states that she is not sure if the signs will help where they are if NYSDOT states that they are in the site distance. K. Veitch states that you can put markers on the property. J. Szpak asks should the signs be double sided signs or parallel to the road. D. Eskoff states that maybe the sign needs more lighting to it whether, there is lighting shining on the signs or a light attached to the sign. K. Perrotte states that there are not any lights on the sign currently. D. Eskoff states that fencing and stone work would look nice in the front of the park. D. Eskoff states that question is do we allow the sign size and or two signs. J. Szpak asks if the sign

could go parallel to the road. K. Veitch states that it is up you and the owner if you want one sign or two back to back. K. Perrotte asks how we can put a sign up to show where the park is. Can we keep the bottom sign? K. Veitch states pull one out or you can move one back. K. Perrotte asks can I put a sign saying Park Entrance. K. Veitch and D. Eskoff state no. D. Eskoff asks if there is a school bus stop sign there. K. Perrotte states that he did not speak to the school district. K. Perrotte states that he is not sure who to speak with at the school district. D. Eskoff states that he needs to get NYSDOT out there to make sure the site distance is fine. K. Perrotte asks whose jurisdiction is it. K. Veitch states that if it is a NYS maintained road then it's the state if it's a county maintained road then the county, if it's a town road then the town maintains the road. L. Sanda states that you need to read the sign code. D. Eskoff states that she thinks they can have enter/exit sign if they go the Planning Board. K. Veitch states that there are two options 1) single sided sign or 2) they use both signs together to make double sided sign. K. Perrotte states that he is not the owner and he doesn't feel as though he can make that decision. K. Veitch states that if the owner is OK with the one sign then you will draw your application and you can go to the Planning Board. K. Veitch states we can table this until you find out what your boss would like to do. K. Perrotte states that is fine with him.

MOTION: J. Szpak
SECOND: L. Sanda

VOTES: Ayes: K. Veitch, D. Eskoff, C. Kolakowski, L. Sanda, J. Szpak,
Noes: None

RESOLUTION: Royal Rhino Owner, LLC Area Variance

RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals tables the application for Case # 974 of Royal Rhino Owners, LLC, contingent upon the verification of the signs, getting NYSDOT out to the site and determine how many signs the owner would like.

Gage, C. Case# 977
218 Bockes Rd.

Area Variance

Carl Gage is present for the application. K. Veitch asks if C. Gage can see the neighbors from his property. C. Gage states the land on both sides of him is vacant. L. Sanda asks who owns those properties. C. Gage states that the people live out of state. K. Veitch states that this should be very easy. K. Veitch states that we will set a public hearing on April 4, 2017 and will be our first order of business.

MOTION: K. Veitch
SECOND: D. Eskoff

VOTES: Ayes: K. Veitch, D. Eskoff, C. Kolakowski, L. Sanda, J. Szpak,
Noes: None

RESOLUTION: Carl Gage Area Variance

RESOLVED that the Zoning Board of Appeals accepts the application for Case # 977 of Carl Gage for an area variance and sets a public hearing for April 4, 2017.

**Ford, P. Case# 975
468 Maple Ave.**

Area Variance

Applicant is requesting an area variance. Corinna Martino is present for the applicant. C. Martino states that they are looking for an area variance. C. Martino states that Patricia Ford is looking to build a Psychotherapy practice in this building. C. Martino states that this is a non-conforming building. C. Martino states that they are planning on big changes to the driveway. C. Martino states that they are planning on the parking lot to have 15 parking spots, with two handicap spots and the narrowest point of the parking lot is twelve feet. C. Martino states that she is not sure if this is a Planning Board or Zoning Board of Appeals. L. Sanda asks if there will be buffers along the right of way. C. Martino states that they plan on putting a six foot white fence on the south side. D. Eskoff asks if this is going to be a business and a residence. C. Martino states no just a business. K. Veitch states that we need to know the lot frontage, lot size and the total lot size, Front yard setbacks and side setbacks. K. Veitch states that we are opening the public hearing up at 8:44 and asks if there is anyone from the public that would like to speak regarding this case. Eric Carlson from 464 Maple Ave is present. E. Carlson states that he owns the property next to this particular property and just wanted to mention that earlier this year he applied for an area variance and was denied. D. Eskoff states that we need to go back and look at that case. K. Veitch asks if there is anyone else that would like to speak regarding this property. K. Veitch states that because there is no one else from the public to speak in regards to this project we will close the public hearing at 8:50 p.m. L. Sanda asks if the property is now residential or commercial. C. Martino states that it is a home and no one is living there. D. Eskoff states that she feels that we need to review the entire Carlson project. D. Eskoff states the work shown in the plan is substantially different than the original application so we are opening a new public hearing.

MOTION: D. Eskoff

SECOND: K. Veitch

VOTES: Ayes: K. Veitch, D. Eskoff, C. Kolakowski, L. Sanda, J. Szpak,
Noes: None

RESOLUTION: Patricia Ford, Area Variance

Resolved, that the Zoning Board of Appeals postpones the review of the present application for Case # 975 of Patricia Ford for an area variance with contingencies until the April 4, 2017, meeting and will review the ZBA's determinations regarding 464 Maple Ave, Ballston Morningkill, and Eric Carlson.

Meeting adjourned at 9:28 p.m. all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberley McMahon

