

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD**

**PLANNING BOARD**

**APRIL 29, 2008**

**REGULAR MEETING**

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by Gary Dake at 7:00 p.m. On roll call, the following members are present: Gary Dake, Tonya Yasenchak, Lorna Dupouy, Michael Ginley, Thomas Siragusa, Michael Thrailkill and Nathan Duffney, Alternate. John Streit is absent. Gerry McKenna, Zoning Administrator and Charlie Baker, Town Engineer, are present.

---

**APRIL 8, 2008 MINUTES**

MOTION: L. Dupouy

SECOND: T. Yasenchak

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and accepts the minutes of April 8, 2008, with miscellaneous spelling corrections.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Yasenchak, Dupouy, Ginley, Siragusa, Thrailkill, Duffney

Noes: None

Absent: Streit

---

**ADIRONDACK ADVENTURES – SITE PLAN REVIEW**

Brigham Road

Kurt Bedore, Tommell & Associates; Ray Shepard, owner; and Forest Duckett, Excavator are present representing this application. K. Bedore explains that this is an existing seasonal campground and RV park situated on approximately 82 acres in the LDR zone with 112 units including 5 cabins and 4 trailers, and a 15-acre man-made lake that is part of the Sesselman Brook watershed. The campground has a store and pool. There is an existing on site septic system. The applicant is here mainly to propose and request approval under Site Plan Review only for a new wastewater treatment system. The proposed sanitary sewer and underground waste water treatment system consists of shallow seasonal use gravity sewers to three pump stations and an additional grinder pump. This would require a SPDES permit as they are proposing to discharge water of over 1000 gallons per day into groundwater. It would also require NYS DOH review. He states that this project, in a slightly different fashion, but the same concept was approved in the 1994-early 1995 time frame by Brian Fear, also for 112 units. They are proposing no changes beyond sewerage the site and improving the environmental conditions at the site. Currently the 112 units are not sewerage and currently on-site waste water is treated through the septic system. K. Bedore reviews C. Baker's comments in his April 29, 2008 review letter. He states that they did a quick computation on area of disturbance for this improvement and they have about .85 acres for the absorption field area, the rest of it is temporary lineal disturbance, essentially in already disturbed and developed areas or under the roadways. He states that if you were to include the linear disturbances in already developed areas, they would probably be slightly over 1 acre. He states that DEC is very clear for commercial projects that if you are over an acre a SWPPP and NOI would be required. They might ask for relief on that from DEC. The existing water supply was not intentionally omitted from the plans and will be added to a revised plan. The water supply well is on the north west side of the store which supplies the water for the spigets located throughout the campgrounds. DOH is there every year taking water samples and making sure that they are compliant with their permit. The Engineer's Narrative will also be provided describing the system design and the basis, from an

April 29, 2008

engineering standpoint, of the design flows. He states that he has already had preliminary discussions with DEC, DOH and Town of Greenfield – Randy Gallusha, Rob Streeter and Mike Shaw. M. Shaw was not aware that this was previously approved. The previous project was approved for 30 gallons per day per site and the minimum is now 50 gallons. K. Bedore states that the septic has been designed for the 4' separation required by the Town of Greenfield and they would like to entertain a discussion, if the Town would be willing, regarding a waiver of that down to the DOH requirement of 2' of separation. In order to meet those requirements they would currently need to bring in 4500 cubic yards of fill for the 4' separation and under DOH requirements would only need about 2300 cubic yards and the nearest pit is at exit 17. C. Baker states that there is a process in place with the Town Board to request waivers, the applicant would have to go through the process and describe why they are requesting it and what the need is. M. Thraikill questions that the applicant is up-to-date on everything and can use this as a campground and the only thing they are doing is improving the septic system. They could open tomorrow as a campground. He states that a lot of this is engineering issues and he welcomes the improvement. B. Duffney questions where ledge is located in the area of the leach field. F. Duckett states that it is 8 to 9 feet down. B. Duffney states that he lives just down the street and the ledge in some areas is on top of the ground. K. Bedore states that it perks nicely and that they can make the vertical separation of either 2' or 4'. L. Dupouy questions that they were approved for 30 gallons per minute and asks if the 50 gallons includes a buffer. K. Bedore states that they have spoken with M. Shaw and that there is a design range. He states that based on those discussions they arrived at 50 gallons per day per site. M. Shaw was interested in the nature of the use – are the sites used like homes, staying there all summer? The campers are transient and members of a nation wide rental network. Many campers take an extended rental but are there for long weekends, etc. L. Dupouy states that she is only questioning that the figure is really going to meet the applicant's needs or if they are going to have to come back for an increase. F. Duckett states that R. Shepard has another park in South Glens Falls and a number of years ago they went through the same process and they actually monitored the whole park for a whole year and came up with 30 to 34 gallons per day from meter readings. With 50 there is a margin of safety. L. Dupouy states that the other thing that we need to be concerned with is the environmental impact of digging things up. M. Ginley comments on the raised bed and that this appears to be a good thing. T. Siragusa states that 9' below grade does not seem to be a lot. C. Baker explains that theoretically the idea behind the design of septic systems is that you provide enough barrier material for the effluent to transfer through to treat the bacteria. Theoretically 2' is required to remove bacteria before it hits groundwater. The Town of Greenfield goes the extra step and requires 4'. Theoretically when the water goes through that system it no longer has bacteria or pathogens in it. G. Dake states that is also the theory behind the perk test to make sure that it is passing through at a rate that is going to allow that. K. Bedore states that the project design daily flow is 5600 gallons and the SPDES requirements kick in once you go over 1000 gallons. What he gathered from a conversation with R. Gallusha is that DEC doesn't really get overly concerned with SPDES permits until about 10,000. They will still review it for compliance with requirements, but they would prefer the DOH review it. T. Yasenchak states that some of these things are out of this board's hands. As to asking for the waiver of the NOI, she does not necessarily agree with the concept that areas are already disturbed because if the applicant is going to dig it up it is being disturbed again. That will be up to the applicant to prove to C. Baker and she states that there is a level of safety because they are so close. She questions that C. Baker stated that the Town Board has a process to waive the 4' and asks if it is there for people with specific issues such as Lake Desolation and that the intent was for tight lots or for areas where it is difficult to fit in a system. C. Baker states that T. Yasenchak is absolutely right. The process was enacted more or less for existing conditions where it was very difficult when you have a failing system to come in and meet that requirement. They felt that there needed to be some kind of relief there for people who have existing homes in order to do that. If the applicant chose to approach the Town Board, this would be kind of a new application and he thinks they would be less lenient towards something like that. K. Bedore states that it kind of sounds like requesting a variance and the need to show hardship or rationale. G. Dake states that he is not sure hardship is something that they have considered. He thinks it is more an engineering impossibility. G. Dake asks what the existing effluent disposal system is – is it a carry in/carry out or is there a location for dumping. K. Bedore states that they are dumping into the existing septic tank and explains the existing septic system. They were not proposing emergency backup for power, however in lieu of that they

April 29, 2008

are proposing to provide one day of emergency storage above the high alarm mark. They will have provisions on the control panel to plug in a generator if necessary. M. Thraikill asks about the timeline and whether they will be able to do this while they have campers. R. Shepard states that they will be doing it as soon as they can, they have done it before and will work on one section at a time. K. Bedore states that DOH is currently about 3 weeks backlogged and they are proposing to begin late May/early June and they have talked about construction phasing. G. Dake asks if they are going to be abandoning the current field or if the store will continue to use it. F. Duckett states that they will continue to use what is there. G. Dake asks G. McKenna about the site plan review and special use permit. G. McKenna states that they usually go hand-in-hand but that this application only needs a site plan review. G. Dake states that there is no change in activity. SEQRA is discussed and C. Baker suggests that a long form would be appropriate because of the agency reviews by DOH and DEC. Public hearing is discussed and if the applicant can have a long form SEQRA in to the Town by close of business tomorrow (4/30/08) a public hearing will be scheduled for May 13, 2008 at 7:00 p.m. K. Bedore will be providing an updated map as soon as possible. K. Bedore states that there is some narrative included on one of the pages of the plan provided. G. Dake states that he thinks that the applicant will have a hard time getting relief from the 4' separation, but that the Board is comfortable with the idea of improving the septic situation.

---

**SAM MITCHELL – PUD DISCUSSION**

S. Mitchell asked that this discussion be postponed. G. Dake explains that he spoke with S. Mitchell who explained that he would like to propose some affordable town house type housing on Mill Road. S. Mitchell is working on gathering information on the sewer and water systems. G. Dake states that conceptually it is a good idea, there is a lot of engineering work to be done to make this happen because one of the problems with density and affordable housing is infrastructure. G. Dake states that he thinks that the PUD would be the appropriate concept because we do not have anything envisioned in the code that would allow that kind of density otherwise.

---

**DAVE JELENIK – MINOR SUBDIVISION**

Braim Road

T. Yasenchak recuses herself. D. Jelenik states that part of the taxes were not paid on this property and therefore the Real Property Office would not accept the maps for filing and the 62 days expired. G. Dake reviews that this is the minor subdivision on the corner of Braim Road, he reviews the previous approvals and states that the Planning Board has the power to reaffirm this. The technical solution would be that the applicant would have to reapply, pay fees and go through the process. The Board consensus is to reaffirm. G. Dake states that he did speak with W. Barss as one of the original conditions was that there was to be clearing for sight distance. That was done and the Town has continued to maintain that as part of their regular roadside maintenance.

**RESOLUTION - DAVE JELENIK, Minor Subdivision**

MOTION: M. Ginley

SECOND: M. Thraikill

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board reaffirms its December 11, 2007 approval of a minor subdivision for Dave Jelenik for property located at 255 Daniels Road, TM#152.-1-12.13, waives any additional fees, waives a new public hearing and reaffirms it's prior SEQRA findings.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Dupouy, Ginley, Siragusa, Thraikill, Duffney

Noes: None

Abstain: Yasenchak

Absent: Streit

April 29, 2008

**DISCUSSION**

G. Dake provides the Board members with copies of the Town of Greenfield Code of Ethics and states that for the purposes of the code, the Board members are all considered town employees, even though they are not compensated, when it comes to ethical constraints. He discusses conflicts of interest and receipt of gifts exceeding \$25, that recusing oneself is at the member's discretion not anyone else's and gives examples of times that Board members have recused themselves. He states that Mark Schachner spoke at a conference once on the subject and stated that if you know how you are going to vote on a project before you have opened the application, you have a conflict and should not be reviewing that project – for or against. Every project has to be looked at on its own merits. G. Dake states that he happens to be one of the three people on the Ethics Board and the board has never met, which speaks well for the Town.

---

Meeting adjourned 7:50 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland  
Secretary