

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD

September 10, 2024

REGULAR MEETING

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by Tonya Yasenchak-Chair at 7:00 p.m. On roll call the following members are present Steve Licciardi, Beth Podhajecki, Joe Sabanos, Robert Roeckle, Tonya Yasenchak and Clyde Ronk, alternate. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer is absent. Justin Reckner, Zoning Administrator/Code Enforcement Officer is present. Charlie Dake and Butch Duffney are absent. Clyde Ronk has full voting privileges for the entirety of the meeting.

Minutes

August 13, 2024

MOTION: J. Sabanos
SECOND: R. Roeckle

RESOLVED, The Planning Board waives the reading of and accepts the August 13, 2024 Minutes with minor corrections.

VOTE: Ayes: S. Licciardi, B. Podhajecki, J. Sabanos, R. Roeckle, T. Yasenchak, and C. Ronk
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: C. Dake and B. Duffney

August 27, 2024

Minutes to be reviewed at the next meeting.

Old Business & Public Hearing

Orthwein, W. Case #736
TM# 152.-1-77.1 & 77.2

SUP
18 Bloomfield Road

Will and Tabatha Orthwein are present. T. Yasenchak explains how a public hearing works. W. Orthwein states that he would like to use his farm for recreational fields for Saratoga Springs Youth Flag Football and Polo. Polo has been a tradition in Saratoga Springs for years. He met with J. Reckner regarding this project. Since then, he has spoken with his neighbors and got a traffic study done. He states that they received a Mass Gathering Permit from the Town Board for the first Saturday. They did have approximately 550 kids and 28 teams. They made some minor changes to the parking so it will go more smoothly. There was not much impact on the traffic. He states that there was a lot of people in favor of this. T. Yasenchak opens the public hearing at 7:05 p.m. There is no one present to speak about this project. She closes the public hearing at 7:06 p.m. T. Yasenchak asks C. Baker if needs anything else. C. Baker states that all engineering issues have been addressed. J. Sabanos asks if there were

any complaint. W. Orthwein states no. He states that they have handicapped parking and that was good, because there were a lot of grandparents that attended. For football they will be adding another restroom. He feels that they have the parking schedule down and the traffic will go smoothly. The Board reviews Part 1 Long Form SEQRA. The Board reviews Part 2 Long Form SEQRA. The Board reviews Part 3 Long Form SEQRA and checks the first box indicating a Negative Declaration.

MOTION: R. Roeckle
SECOND: S. Licciardi

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board completes Part II of the Long Form SEQRA. All questions are answered "no" and the first box is checked, indicating that this will not result in no significant negative environmental impacts for the for a Recreational Field of William Orthwein for property located at 18 Bloomfield Road, TM# 152.-1-77.1 and 152.-1-77.2.

VOTE: Ayes: S. Licciardi, B. Podhajecki, J. Sabanos, R. Roeckle, T. Yasenchak, and C. Ronk
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: C. Dake and B. Duffney

MOTION: . B. Podhajecki
SECOND: C. Ronk

RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby grants approval for William Orthwein for property located at 18 Bloomfield Road, to allow recreational fields for Saratoga Springs Youth Flag Football and Pollo, TM# 152.-1-77.1 and 152.-1-77.2 noting that the Long Form SEQRA was reviewed and there are environmental impacts and the Board reviewed the requirements (Questions A-Q in the Code) for a Special Use Permit.

VOTE: Ayes: S. Licciardi, B. Podhajecki, J. Sabanos, R. Roeckle, T. Yasenchak, and C. Ronk
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: C. Dake and B. Duffney

Saratoga Escape Case #734
TM# 126.-1-81.1

SUP/SPR
265 Brigham Road

Matt Huntington and Ray Shephard are present. R. Roeckle states that the Board closed the public hearing at their last meeting. He asks if the applicant has submitted any additional information. This project is a creation of a new septic system. M. Huntington states that they provided the Long Form SEQRA Form. R. Roeckle asks C. Baker if he is requiring anything else. C. Baker states that he does not have any remaining questions. The Board reviews Part of the Long Form SEQRA. The Board reviews Part 2 Long Form SEQRA. The Board reviews Part 3 of the Long Form SEQRA and checks the first box indicating no significant environmental impacts.

MOTION: R. Roeckle
SECOND: J. Sabanos

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board completes Part II of the Long Form SEQRA. All questions are answered "no" and the first box is checked, indicating that this will not result in no significant negative environmental impacts for the for a new septic system for Saratoga Escape, property located at 265 Brigham Road, TM# 126.-1-81.1

VOTE: Ayes: S. Licciardi, B. Podhajecki, J. Sabanos, R. Roeckle, T. Yasenchak, and C. Ronk
 Noes: None
 Abstain: None
 Absent: C. Dake and B. Duffney

MOTION: C. Ronk
 SECOND: S. Licciardi

RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby grants approval for Saratoga Escape for property located at 265 Brigham Road, to install a central sewer system for the campground, TM# 126.-1-81.1 noting that the Long Form SEQRA was reviewed and there are environmental impacts and the Board reviewed the requirements (Questions A-Q in the Code) for a Special Use Permit/Site Plan Review contingent upon:

- The Town of Greenfield receives the SWPP and NOI
- Provide the Final Certificate
- NYS DEC and NYS DOH letter
- The address number be placed outside so that it is noticeable.

VOTE: Ayes: S. Licciardi, B. Podhajecki, J. Sabanos, R. Roeckle, T. Yasenchak, and C. Ronk
 Noes: None
 Abstain: None
 Absent: C. Dake and B. Duffney

Old Business

Cartier, C. Cas #730
 TM# 150.-3-25.40, 99, 163.-2-22.1, & 22.2

Major Subdivision
 1 Sand Hill Road

Aaron Vera and Cohen Cartier are present. A. Vera states that the last time he was in front of the Board for this project was in August and they took a few weeks to gather more information. They provided a memo calculating the site distance and the proposed driveways. He states that none of the driveways meet ASSHTO Standards for the site distance. They are in front of the Board tonight to discuss their options. T. Yasenchak states that the Board always asks for ASSHTO Standards. They never vary away from that. The Board recently did not approve a 2-lot subdivision on King Road because of the site distance. T. Yasenchak asks C. Baker if he has anything to add. C. Baker states that sums it up. They are looking for ASSHTO Standards site distance and they have not accepted anything less. It is a significant ask and there is no mitigation. C. Baker states that it is posted 40 miles per hour and they did site distance with 50 miles per hour. It is a liability and he does not know what else to offer them. A. Vera states that they did not do a traffic study they used the NYS DOT counter. He states that if the speed limit was reduced to 30 miles per hour lot 5 meets the site distance and 35 miles per hour lot 1 would meet the site distance. He states that this was an approved subdivision. They are proposing signage. R. Roeckle states that Town's and Counties can not lower the speed

limit NYS DOT must authorize the speed limit to be lowered. C. Baker states that it may have been an existing subdivision however, this is considered a new subdivision at this point. They can not mitigate the site distance with signage. T. Yasenchak asks C. Baker what is the difference if using AASHTO Standards verses NYS DOT. C. Baker states that the issue involved a car accident and the Town was sued. Since then the Town got strictest as possible. The Town needs to be in a defensible position. ASSHTO Standards are the stricter in the DOT Code. There was meeting with Town Council a long time ago. R. Roeckle states if they can't make site distance then they can't meet it. B. Podhajecki asks if any lot met the site distance. A. Vera states no. B. Podhajecki suggests do a road. A. Vera states that they can't without disturbing the wetlands. If they move forward with this it would mean massive wetland mitigation, about 20 acres. He states that ASSHTO Standards are used as guidance for the States. J. Sabanos states that 40 miles per hour is a lot for that road. A. Vera states lot 7 is 50 miles per hour they did with reduced speed. Lot 6 has the lowest site distance to the left. J. Sabanos states that this came from Legal Council he feels the Board needs to stick with that and not set precedent. C. Ronk agrees. S. Licciardi agrees and states that it is a tough group of lots. T. Yasenchak agrees with C. Baker and they are asking the Board to deviate from what they require. 1 mile up the road may be different from where they are at. She states that that the Board is not asking them to spend money she does not know how they can move forward. A. Vera states that even if they did a traffic study it won't be possible. Is it possible for his client to meet with the Town Council? C. Baker states the Town Council looks to the Planning Board for this. He states that ASSHTO Standards are 305' and NYS DOT Standards is 175' that is pretty significant. A. Vera states reads DOT table and the highway design Manual it always goes by the National Highway System. T. Yasenchak states Town Council does not give guidance. She states that she agrees with C. Baker Town Council looks to the Planning Board for safety. The Board has not had a different standard in the last 15 minutes. She states that she is not sure what their next steps are. C. Baker suggests to not meet with Town Council, meet with the Town Board. T. Yasenchak states the Town Council did not require the Planning Board to do this the Town of Greenfield had a liability. She can ask Town Council. R. Roeckle asks there is no way to move the driveways. A. Vera states they can get the driveways, but they have to go through the wetlands. If they go back to the original subdivision do they have to come back in front of the Planning Board. R. Roeckle asks if there is not a road on the property. A. Vera states correct. It conforms with the lot. C. Baker states that the NYS DOH approval has expired and a road bond would be required. T. Yasenchak asks if a road bond was put in place. R. Roeckle states not sure what it was 30 years ago if there was anything like that. C. Cartier states even though the driveways are already there. T. Yasenchak states that the Board didn't lot at the 2-lot subdivision on King Road because of the site distance. A. Vera asks if there is no further review of the project. T. Yasenchak states not until she confers with Town Council.

New Business

Faminano, M. & A. Case #740
TM# 151.-2-39

Minor Subdivision
17 Canty Road

Jim Vianna is present for the applicant. T. Yasenchak states that this is a 3-lot subdivision in the MDR-2 District. They had a survey done 20 years ago. The applicants live in the log home on the property. Lot 2 is for their son and they figured that seeing as they were doing a subdivision they might as well do 3 lots. He states that the setbacks are straight forward. T. Yasenchak asks if the site distance lot 2 and 3 have new driveways. She states that the site distance should be ASSHTO Standards for Intersection stopping. Lot 3 is a

keyhole lot. She states that she likes to see family stay in the Town. Keyhole lots are unique. R. Roeckle asks if the barn on lot 3 exists. J. Vianna states yes, the wife owns horse. It is a run-in shed for the horse. R. Roeckle states that he understands, but the Town Code states that accessory structures need to have a Primary Principal Use (Single-family residence). T. Yasenchak agrees and the property on Kilmer Road needed a variance. C. Baker agrees. J. Vianna states that they will need to move the horse and/or the barn. J. Vianna states that to continue they will need to move the barn to lot 1. J. Sabanos states that the Board will need to have a set time for the new house. T. Yasenchak states that this is not going to require a variance the Code allows for new tools to help the applicants to do what they want. J. Vianna states that they Board does not have the 5-year rule anymore. J. Vianna states that the simplest thing would be to move lot 1. R. Roeckle states that as long as he does not run into an issue with the stable. He does not have a problem with the subdivision. He states that the Board will need to see where the proposed house, septic system, and well will be located. There is wetlands on the property, Bell Brook, get a letter from NYS DEC. J. Vianna states that this does not think so, but he will look into it. T. Yasenchak asks about a personal farm in MDR-2 District. She asks if J. Reckner will write a letter regarding the allowance of personal farm activity. R. Roeckle states if they move the horse to lot 1 he will be good with this project. T. Yasenchak states that the Board is limited by the Code. B. Podhajecki states that the Code is so complicated. She states move the shed if they want lot 3. J. Sabanos states that he would like to see the site distance on the map. S. Licciardi agrees and states they need to determine if they want lot 3. C. Baker states that he would like to see topography, driveways, and show the limits of clearing on the map. Lot 3 looks close to the existing buildings. J. Vianna states that it is pretty much cleared and they will only be doing a bit of disturbance. J. Vianna states he can layout the limits of disturbance. C. Baker states Bell Brook is a classified stream. He suggests check with NYS DEC's regulations. J. Vianna asks check with the Town or NYS. C. Baker states NYS DEC. J. Vianna states that Bell Brook is way above where they are proposing anything. No wetlands on the property. T. Yasenchak states moving forward move the barn. The Board will need to see site distance, propose driveways, topography, proposed home, septic system, and well on the map. C. Baker states that the Board will need to see the limits of clearing for each lot including for the home well and septic. The Board sets a public hearing for September 24, 2024.

Peyser, C. Case #741
TM# 138.-2-29

Sketch Plan Review Minor Subdivision
137 Wilton Road

Paul Davis is present. T. Yasenchak recuses herself. R. Roeckle is Chair person for this case. P. Davis states that he and Cathy Peyser are cousins and their children want to build homes for themselves on the property. He states that they are proposing 3 new lots 6 acres each. There is 30+ acres there. He states they are trying to be very cautious of the wetlands. 3 driveways coming out on Wilton Road. B. Podhajecki states there is no frontage. P. Davis states correct, keyhole lots. J. Sabanos asks if they are meeting the minimum of 40' for a driveway. R. Roeckle states that it looks like lots 1 and 4 are keyhole lots. R. Roeckle states the subdivision looks OK but, that it looks like lots 2 and 3 have 40' frontage and 250' is required. He states that they can do keyhole lots if they are considered keyhole lots, because none meet Code. B. Podhajecki asks how many acres are there? P. Davis states 37 acres. J. Sabanos states that the lots are ugly, but you can't help that. 40' is what is required for keyhole lots, even for the shared driveways which the Board does not like. He states that from a planning about perspective it is not pretty. Roeckle states lot 4 is not a keyhole lot. He asks about lots 1, 2, and 3. They would need a right of way and easements for protection. They will need site distance for all of the driveways. J. Reckner states depending on how long the driveways are

they may need turn-arounds for emergency vehicles. They should talk to their design professional. The Code sections 503-511 of the 2020 Fire Safety Code and pull-offs are required. P. Davis states that one of the lots they are not building on yet. R. Roeckle states that he is concerned about the wetlands on lot 2. Have the wetlands been classified. He suggests have NYS DEC go out to the property. C. Baker states that he does not like long driveways, it might be cost affective to do a road. R. Roeckle states in most case family doesn't retain ownership forever. He is concerned with lot 4. He feels that they need variances. That takes 2 months and they have to get their variances before the Board can take-action. B. Podhajecki states that the driveways ae close. R. Roeckle states he is concerned about the wetlands. R. Roeckle states that he highly recommends that in the deeds put the shared driveway along with rights-of-way and shared driveways. He sates that he would rather see shared driveways for the first 300' for lots 1, 2, and 3. B. Podhajecki states that lot 4 makes sense if they get a variance. R. Roeckle reads the definition of a keyhole lot. S. Licciardi agrees with the need for a variance. C. Baker states feels that a variance is appropriate. R. Roeckle states the lot to the west needs a variance and the other 3 lots are keyhole lots. Lots 1, 2, and 4 need variances for frontage. J. Sabanos states that he would like to see the wetlands delineated. R. Roeckle states contact NYS DEC. P. Davis states C. Baker states that they should also check with Army Corp. of Engineer and have them do delineation there too. P. Davis states that they are staying away from the wetlands. R. Roeckle states that the wetlands still need to be delineated. He states that they may want to look at the site distance for the lots at 55 miles per hour.

Respectfully submitted by,

Kimberley McMahon
Planning Board Executive Secretary