

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD**

**PLANNING BOARD**

**JULY 11, 2006**

**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, Thomas Siragusa, John Streit and Michael Thraikill. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer is present. Dan Cochran, Mark Young, and Gerry McKenna, Zoning Administrator, are absent.

---

**JUNE 27, 2006 MINUTES**

MOTION: M. Thraikill

SECOND: L. Dupouy

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and accepts the minutes of June 27, 2006, with the following corrections:

- **MICHAEL HICKAM** – clarify sentence to read: He states that he and ... inspected the **under drain** system
- **MICHAEL HICKAM** – correct from ‘site plan’ to - G. Dake states **sketch** plan approval...
- **DISCUSSION** – If you make a comment to the press...**project**, you can be....

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Dupouy, Siragusa, Streit, Thraikill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Cochran, Young

---

**CORRESPONDENCE**

G. Dake refers to a letter he received from Michael Italiano who lives in Shirley, NY, and they will be meeting on Thursday, regarding a property that he wishes to develop off the corner of Spier Falls Road and 9N. G. Dake states that if anyone is interested, let him know.

---

**PLANNING BOARD CASES**

**FRANK BENCZE – Minor Subdivision**

North Creek Road

F. Bencze is present and G. Dake reviews the County Planning Board referral letter. C. Baker states that he looked at the plans and has no engineering issues. A public hearing is opened at 7:05 p.m. There being no public comments, this public hearing is closed at 7:06 p.m.

The Board members have no concerns; the applicant has addressed all questions. **The Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered “no”. T. Yasenchak makes a motion to check Box B, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impacts. L. Dupouy seconds the motion. All present in favor.**

July 11, 2006

**RESOLUTION – F. Bencze, Minor Subdivision**

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: M. Thraikill

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants minor subdivision approval to Frank Bencze for property located at 555 North Creek Road, TM#137.-1-34.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Dupouy, Siragusa, Streit, Thraikill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Cochran, Young

---

**BRYAN MacPHERSON – Minor Subdivision and Lot Line Adjustments**

Squashville Road and Bockes Road

Bryan MacPherson is present and provides the Board with the SEQRA form and a map with the contours. C. Baker states that notes are good, but lot configuration is odd. Applicant explains his reasoning. A public hearing is opened at 7:10 p.m. There being no public comment, this public hearing is closed at 7:11 p.m.

T. Yasenchak asks about the right of way. B. MacPherson explains that he used to own the log cabin and kept it for access to the rear property. The easement was written into the deed. Clarification as to what is being subdivided is requested. Further discussion takes place regarding the easement/right of way and what can or cannot be done with it depends on how the deed is written. **The Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered “no”. L. Dupouy makes a motion to check Box B, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impacts. T. Yasenchak seconds the motion. All present in favor.** G. Dake asks for any additional comments from the Board. T. Yasenchak states that she does not see the note regarding the 5-year rule. C. Baker agrees that this needs to be on the map.

**RESOLUTION – B. MacPherson, Minor Subdivision and Lot Line Adjustments**

MOTION: T. Yasenchak

SECOND: M. Thraikill

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants a minor subdivision and lot line adjustments to Bryan MacPherson for property located at 21 Squashville Road, TM#137.-2-45.112 contingent upon:

- **The addition of the note regarding no further subdivision for 5 years**

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Dupouy, Siragusa, Streit, Thraikill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Cochran, Young

---

**MICHAEL HICKAM – Major Subdivision**

Medbury Road

No one is present representing this application.

---

**SARATOGA POLO – Site Plan Review**

Bloomfield Road

G. Dake explains for the new Board members that the Planning Board had made a recommendation

July 11, 2006

to the Town Board who ultimately passed PUD legislation and Polo is back for site plan review. Lisa Nagle, Jack Daily, Jim Rossi, Jere Tadich, Tim O'Brien, and Charles Dumas are present. L. Nagle submits a drawing with a few changes and more details than the previous submission. She states that everything is fairly the same as when the Board initially saw it. She explains that the intersection was washed away with the beaver dam that broke and they worked with the Town to reconfigure and reconstruct the intersection to the way it was recommended in the SEQRA process. That is now completed. G. Dake states that he wants to give the applicant credit for stepping up at the time and working with the Town. L. Nagle explains that the Lodge has moved closer to the events building for efficiency sake. The building uses are still the same. They have changed from 5 to 6 retreat residences, but have reduced the mass of those buildings as they want these to look like large homes. G. Dake asks if the total number of living units changed and L. Nagle states that it did not. L. Nagle states that they are going to have covered parking near each residence along with some surface parking, so that there is designated parking for each of the 6 units. G. Dake asks if they have looked at the percentage of lot coverage? Applicant states that they are within that. L. Nagle goes over the items still being worked on such as the storm water detention basins, lighting, etc. J. Rossi states that they have left the north and south sides of the field as open flat area, and while they have a substantial number of parking spaces, all of this can be used for parking from a functional standpoint as well. M. Thrailkill asks about the ponies being stabled overnight. J. Daily reiterates that as part of the PUD they had stated that they were not going have stabling on the premises. J. Streit asks about the 'retreat residences'. J. Rossi explains that they are 2, 3 and 4 bedroom units. They just got their feasibility study back from their research firm with a recommendation for what those units should be. Each one of the six buildings will be phased in. They also just received approval from the Attorney General's office for their test of market. During this Polo season, they will be finding potential customers and finding out what the demand for 2, 3 and 4 bedroom units would be. He states that during the PUD process they left themselves some flexibility in terms of how to package, how much usage each person would get, etc. They believe they will be selling about a 5-week program. What has been recommended now is a mix of about 40% 3-bedroom, 40% 2-bedroom and 20% 4-bedroom. Toward the end of the summer they will have more definitive information. There are also some units in the Lodge building itself. J. Rossi discusses some of the amenities on the grounds. L. Dupouy states that she likes the new orientation of the Lodge. J. Streit asks the purpose of the pond. It is pointed out that this is an existing pond, part of the wetlands. For disclosure sake, J. Streit asks if Mrs. Rossi is a friend of Cathy Perry, who is J. Streit's sister-in-law, and Mrs. Rossi made a donation to the African medical mission with which J. Streit is associated. T. Siragusa has some questions regarding setbacks. G. Dake states that when a PUD is created, you are creating your own bulk standards, but that does not preclude the Board from discussing with the applicant if they believe something is too close to property lines, etc. L. Nagle states that she believes the rear setback is about 25-30'. J. Rossi states that the aesthetic issue with the carport/stables is to not see a mass of cars all in one place. They believe that the neighbors would rather look at something that looks like the back of stables rather than surface parking. There is also some surface parking scattered throughout the area. T. Yasenchak asks what the proposed uses of the Lodge are. J. Rossi states that the Lodge consists of conference rooms with terraces, the lobby, breakfast area for the residents if they want to eat outside their units, some common areas like a billiard room, exercise area, hot tub, indoor/outdoor pool, spa, etc. These are the central amenities for the residents themselves, but there are some more public areas such as the conference rooms, etc. J. Streit asks J. Rossi about the rental program for the units. J. Rossi explains how it will work and that they will be gathering further information during the testing phases. T. Yasenchak asks about the additional parking mentioned which is not shown on the map. J. Daily and J. Rossi explain on the map and indicate that the open flat land will be used for overflow. T. Yasenchak explains that her question is related to the number of spaces needed for employees, residents, visitors, etc. She does not necessarily want to see additional pavement. J. Rossi indicates the employee parking. J. Rossi explains the rotation of playing on the Whitney field and the adjacent fields they rent from Skidmore. He explains that it is unlikely that they would have a wedding or event going on when there is a Polo match. T. Yasenchak asks where the actual wetlands boundary is located. L. Nagle states that they took off the line so that it would be easier to read and indicates that it is ACOE wetlands, so there is no buffer. She indicates the location on the map. G. Dake asks about vegetative buffers to the properties of Orthwein and Priest. The applicant indicates that one of the things they are talking about is putting up a low

July 11, 2006

fence along the back of the property so that any car lights turning in that direction would be shielded and also maintaining the existing vegetation. G. Dake asks if someone has had conversations with W. Orthwein. Regarding the Priest property, J. Rossi states that there is substantial vegetative buffer and that his property is below their grade. It is pointed out that there is also a wetlands buffer in this area. G. Dake states that as we go on with the process, he wants to make sure that a fair amount of time is spent discussing phasing to make sure that should anything happen to stop this project somewhere along the line, all of the infrastructure that has been discussed is in place or bonded. He states that he has had a number of phone calls from Fred McNeary with a lot of concerns on sewer and a few concerns on water. There is a question as to a water line that might be running down very close to this property, although G. Dake states that he has not seen an official map. He asks the applicant to provide an estimate of what the water usage would be other than what groundwater would be used for. Prestwick Chase is currently using 7,100 gallons per day, according to F. McNeary, and the Stewart's Plant is using 75,000 gallons per day. While they are not eager to buy all of that replacement, with Polo's combined usage, there is a very short run which could provide the basis for a public water system. If the applicant wants to tie into such a proposed line, there would be engineering issues to discuss. C. Dumas states that the PUD contemplated that if a municipal system became available, they would connect. G. Dake states that he recalls that this was discussed, but wasn't sure if that had become part of the PUD. L. Nagle states that it is. G. Dake states that it would be worth talking to someone at County Planning to find out where they are with the plans. It could be out just far enough that Polo would have to put in the infrastructure for the wells, and then go back in a couple years. Sewer is the big issue that F. McNeary has brought up to G. Dake. He is still gravely concerned that Polo is going to try to do something that will not cause an upgrade on the downstream piping on Kirby Road. F. McNeary stated that he had received a letter requesting testing and was concerned that Jim DiPasquale was not copied on that letter. J. Daily states that they have had challenges in discussions with F. McNeary. C. Dumas states that it has always been their contemplation and representation to this Board that that was going to be part of their project. T. O'Brien states that they met with the City DPW, told them what the concerns were, and if it is required the applicant would upgrade that line. T. O'Brien explains the mechanics of the lines. He states that they have met with the McNeary's, explained what they are planning on doing, sent a letter that they will be doing testing on the system and that it was requested by Jim DiPasquale. J. DiPasquale has provided the applicant preliminary 'as-built' plans, because neither the Town nor the McNeary's had any, of the pump station. He states that they have been trying to work with Prestwick Chase to make this run smoothly, but there have been some road blocks. C. Dumas states that they are going to be organizing a transportation corporation and that would involve the Town's participation. He states that as we move through the Site Plan process, that will be a parallel tract where those things will have to occur. One thing he does not have that would be helpful, and he is not sure if the Town has that information, would be PSE approvals for Putnam Brook. G. Dake suggests they check with the Town Clerk. T. O'Brien states that two wells have been drilled and they are waiting to drill the third until they finalize the positions of the units and stormwater. G. Dake asks, with the understanding that this still needs to be engineered, does the applicant have an estimate of water usage. T. O'Brien states that it was approximately in the neighborhood of 50,000. C. Baker states that they have previously addressed what will be the engineering issues with stormwater being a big one. He states that the screening with the Orthwein property does appear close to that line, the rest of the plan looks good, well laid out. T. Yasenchak states that previously the applicant had preliminary drawings of what the buildings would look like. The applicant displays a rendering. J. Rossi states that in looking at the originals, they were not in keeping with the concept of making them look like big houses. There will be variations in the roof lines, the landscaping will be different and they are designed to potentially have variations in their looks. There will be variations in the materials also – stone, brick and shingle. The design concept was a combination of Kentucky horse farm, Victorian shingle and Adirondack Great Camp. J. Rossi states that when they took it to 10 units from 12, it allowed the applicant to have lower rooflines allowing the buildings to look less institutional. Discussion takes place about the 38' height. G. Dake states that there is still heavy work to be done on the engineering.

---

July 11, 2006

**FRANK FLANAGAN - Special Use Permit**  
Middle Grove Road

Frank Flanagan is present. G. Dake reviews that F. Flanagan was looking to relocate his horse riding activity from Middle Grove near the Town Park to roughly near the corner of South Greenfield and Middle Grove Roads. A public hearing was held, the Board has talked a lot about this, and we ran into wetlands issues. Some of the issues from the public hearing were: manure disposal and storage; hours of operation; limiting number of horses to 30; ACOE issues; run-in sheds; sight distance; and SEQRA. F. Flanagan reviews his project for the new Board members stating that he does trail rides, sleigh rides, etc. There was the question of bathrooms and he went with porta potties. As far as manure storage, that had been discussed. He has discussed the run-in sheds with G. McKenna. C. Baker has no comments at this time. T. Siragusa asks why the map says Vradenburg and G. Dake explains he was the previous owner. T. Yasenchak asks if the applicant is operating there now. F. Flanagan states that the horses are there, but no activities are taking place even though he has had people stopping by to ride. T. Yasenchak states that she saw an awning up. F. Flanagan states that is the beginning of where a run-in shed will be for storage of tack, to get the horses out of the weather, etc. He states that he had to put that up because the horses were there 45 minutes and Animal Rights was there. T. Yasenchak asks where that building would be on the new map and what he was going to do about the water issue. Comments were made previously about public water for the customers/visitors and also for the horses. F. Flanagan states that they have coolers of beverages for the people, mostly kids, and the porta potty. The water for the animals will come from the creek. T. Yasenchak states that the applicant needs a better map for the wetlands crossing, etc. F. Flanagan states that is all done, and that after 16 months they told him he really did not need anything. He states that as far as ACOE and the County, he is all set with them, they are happy with what he has done. M. Thrailkill asks about water for hand washing for the kids. F. Flanagan states that they will have antibacterial soap. M. Thrailkill asks if this has to go through DEC, DOH or anything? F. Flanagan states that according to the State, as long as there are no more than 25 customers a day on a 5-day a week basis, you are not required to have a rest room or running water. G. Dake states that we did discuss this previously. L. Dupouy asks for locations on the map of parking, porta potties, etc. G. Dake asks applicant for new map showing parking, location of barn, property boundaries, etc. J. Streit asks if the fields will be hayed. Applicant states they will. G. Dake asks the Board exactly what they want to see on the new map. L. Dupouy states office area, barn, awnings, parking dimensions, arena, porta potty, all existing structures and future construction. T. Yasenchak questions a buffer between the parking area and the neighbor. F. Flanagan states that it is a vacant wooded lot. M. Thrailkill asks about handicap facilities and if that is needed. Applicant states that he doesn't offer handicap rides. J. Streit asks about security issues for the horses. F. Flanagan states that there is barbed wire. T. Yasenchak comments on the buffer. The applicant states that there is a stonewall that comes through and the parking lot is already in. G. Dake states that there is no buffer to parking in the Code, the setback is to buildings. F. Flanagan states that there will be a grassy area in front of the stonewall. G. Dake states that someone could build a house in there and they will know what is next to them. T. Yasenchak states that she loves the project, but we have turned down other applications and would like to touch base with G. McKenna on this issue. She asks about the curb cuts. F. Flanagan reiterates that that has been approved. Applicant asks what he needs to be able to open his business. G. Dake states that if the applicant can get a new map to the Board, he could conceivably get approval at the next meeting. G. Dake states that he does not want to short cut the last two weeks, he states that it sounds like the Board would love to see the project happen and he believes that this will be approved. J. Streit asks about negative comments regarding this. F. Flanagan states that he operated his business for 5 years down the road from this location with no complaints. G. Dake confirms this and states that the issues from the public hearing were about the existing conditions from the previous owner and were complimentary of the applicant's cleaning it up.

---

July 11, 2006

**JELENIK CONSTRUCTION – Major Subdivision**  
Greene Road

T. Yasenchak recuses herself. Clark Wilkinson, Paragon Engineering, is present representing the applicant. He reviews that they had initially come to the Board with a concept for 9 lots. They have come up with the existing camp that is on lot 1 plus 6 additional lots and they removed a keyhole lot from the original plan. He has provided a profile for the existing road and the cul-de-sac will be the only part that will be new, the rest of the existing road will be upgraded to public road status. There is an existing crossing, a concrete culvert over the Snook Kill. There are a couple of options they want to discuss with the Board, one of which is to leave that in place, build something over it and span it. The other option is to expand and enlarge it as necessary. He states that he wants to have a discussion with C. Baker or the fire department about what this needs to be designed for – a 50,000 lb. vehicle, a 75,000 lb. vehicle? G. Dake states that we do not get a lot of bridge questions and C. Baker states that a keyhole lot requirement is for a 50,000 lb. vehicle. C. Wilkinson states that they had some soil testing done last week with Charlie Maine. The data was faxed to C. Baker, but they were not able to coordinate getting him out there at the same time. He states that with the data that he provided initially and what C. Maine did last week, it substantiates that the soils that are in here will support septic systems. Every lot except the first three are over 5 acres and there are a number of locations on each lot where one might want to locate a house. He tried to pick where he thought would be the best place. The open space consists of a majority of the wetlands to the rear. C. Baker states that he has not completed a detailed review as he was waiting for the soils which he now has and will do a detailed review. Initial comments would be related to the bridge crossing which will obviously have to be engineered by a structural engineer; soils were a key concern. He did look at them briefly and it does look like they met the requirements for shallow fill systems; and based on the information that has been provided, he is comfortable with that. C. Baker states that he assumes that the applicant is building a Town road and that it is going to be bonded. He asks if the test locations will be shown on a future map. C. Wilkinson states that they will, they have not done the detailed topography and they are picking up the wetlands. Sight distance should not be a problem and C. Wilkinson will provide that information to C. Baker. T. Siragusa asks if anyone is familiar with the site. G. Dake states that D. Ure proposed a project here once and a couple of the Board members have visited it. T. Siragusa asks about a site walk. C. Wilkinson states that the road is passable and the person who built it lives on the rear of the property. G. Dake asks about ownership of the open space. C. Wilkinson states a land conservancy or the Town if they want it. G. Dake states that the Town does not want it and he would not be adverse to joining it to one of the other lots. G. Dake states that the plans will need to be sent to the Saratoga County Planning Board and to the Town of Wilton Planning Board, at least as a courtesy, for their review. A public hearing is scheduled for July 25, 2006. C. Baker suggests the long form SEQRA being completed. Lead Agency letters are discussed and will be sent to anyone who is listed on the long form. The Board will be able to deal with the SEQRA on August 29<sup>th</sup>. Discussion takes place about sight distance and a site walk is scheduled for July 15<sup>th</sup> with the Board members meeting at the Town Hall.

---

**DISCUSSION**

C. Baker provides copies of letters for J. Collura and T. Johnston stating that those projects are ok with him.

---

Meeting adjourned 8:54 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorraine Fiorino  
Clerk