

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

AUGUST 8, 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, and John Streit, Alternate. Dan Cochran, Michael Thraikill and Mark Young are absent. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer and Gerry McKenna, Zoning Administrator are present. M. Thraikill arrives after roll is called.

JULY 25, 2006 MINUTES

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: L. Dupouy

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and accepts the minutes of July 25, 2006 as submitted.

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

Noes: None

Absent: Cochran, Young

PLANNING BOARD CASES

JELENIK CONSTRUCTION – Minor Subdivision

Braim Road

T. Yasenchak recuses herself. A public hearing is opened at 7:02 p.m. C. Wilkinson is present for the applicant and reviews that the applicant has received an area variance for lot 2 for .11 acres; he has added topo to the maps; there are no wetlands; he has indicated the proposed house location for lot 1 and there is no proposed house for lot 2, but the access will be from Daniels Road; he has not yet received the septic plans from Paul Male and will add those to the map along with the soil testing information; and states he has no issues with C. Baker's comments. He states that they are here tonight to hopefully receive preliminary approval. There being no public comment, this public hearing is closed at 7:04 p.m.

C. Baker states that he visited the site with W. Barss to take a look at the vegetation along Daniels Road that M. Young had previously talked about. There is some pretty heavy vegetation along that stretch of the road, so he would recommend that as part of the approval it be required that that vegetation be cleared, that the driveway location for lot 2 be identified and make sure that there is adequate sight distance for that. C. Wilkinson asks if C. Baker would like that added to the plans as a note? G. Dake states that the applicant can just go out and do it. Historically the applicant has gotten a report from a traffic engineer and conditioned the approval that the applicant comply with the report. If the applicant wants to clear in advance, and G. Dake is presuming that some of it is pretty obvious, the applicant would be doing a public service to the people pulling out of Braim Road. J. Streit asks if there are accepted setbacks for clearing. C. Baker states that would be determined by the site of the driveway and what they will need for sight distance along that stretch of the road. They can go back on their own property to get that, which he does not think they will have to, as he believes most of it is within the right-of-way. C. Baker states that he would

August 8, 2006

recommend a note on the plans that it will be done and then that way if it is not done for whatever reason, the building permit doesn't have to be issued on lot 2. G. Dake comments that the applicant owns everything from the Niagara Mohawk right-of-way, which is clear, down to the intersection so it is pretty easy to take a swath and clear it out. C. Baker states that he did have a conversation with Mike Shaw of DOH, today and he said that he is in the process of reviewing this, he has made some recommendations for some things that needed to be tweaked a little bit and would be getting a letter out to that effect. C. Baker would recommend that any approvals the Planning Board makes be contingent upon DOH approval. C. Wilkinson states that M. Shaw actually got that letter out today. C. Baker asks who made the determination that there are no wetlands on the site. C. Wilkinson states that Alton Knapp, Jr. evaluated for the wetlands. M. Thraillkill agrees that the vegetation needs to be cleared. G. Dake states that we are pretty much down to engineering issues. **The Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered "no". J. Streit makes a motion to check Box B, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impacts. T. Siragusa seconds the motion. All present in favor.** Discussion takes place that the open issues are primarily engineering issues that the Board could make a contingency of approval based on C. Baker's satisfaction. J. Streit states that if the applicant could not clear-cut and leave some of the trees, that would be in keeping with how most of the properties on Braim Road look.

RESOLUTION – Jelenik Construction, Minor Subdivision

MOTION: L. Dupouy

SECOND: J. Streit

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants Minor Subdivision approval to Jelenik Construction for property located on the corner of Braim Road and Daniels Road, TM#152.-1-12.13, contingent upon:

- **Review and approval by the Town Engineer and Planning Board Chairman**

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

Noes: None

Absent: Cochran, Young

JELENIK CONSTRUCTION – Major Subdivision

Greene Road

G. Dake states that the Board members are in receipt of correspondence from B. Ure and Mr. Ianniello regarding the ownership of the existing private road. G. Dake states that he has spoken with B. Ure who states that he is not opposed to the subdivision but wants to have the ownership issue resolved. He is willing to work with D. Jelenik to resolve this. C. Wilkinson states that this is up to the attorney's to work out.

HARRY VRADENBURG – Major Subdivision

Dunham Pond, King and South Greenfield Road

Harry Vradenburg and Drew Schaufert are present. D. Schaufert reviews that the applicant owns 116 acres with frontage on Dunham Pond, King and South Greenfield Roads. A lot line adjustment will be done between the existing house lot, 8 acres, and the adjacent property adding approximately 3.7 acres to that lot, and subdividing the remaining property into 5 lots. There are both DEC and ACOE wetlands on the property. D. Schaufert states that there are some issues that C. Baker had pointed out that need to be addressed and he has not had a chance to complete all of that since the last meeting, but hopes to have it completed by the next meeting. G. McKenna states that the lots meet code. Board discusses the open issues and that they would not be comfortable voting on this project until the issues with lot 3 are resolved.

August 8, 2006

A public hearing is opened at 7:17 p.m. There being no public comment, this public hearing is closed at 7:18 p.m.

C. Baker states that he is concerned with the amount of wetlands on lot 3 whether or not they are going to need a fill system there and if they do, there may not be enough room within that building envelope to fit the primary system, replacement system and meet the separations.

STEVE SMERO – Site Plan Review/Special Use Permit

Route 9N

Steve Smero, Jama Peacock, Keith Manz and Charles Sableski are present. A public hearing is opened at 7:20 p.m. C. Sableski reviews that this is a 7000 square foot building that would be used as a doctor's office. He explains the existing and proposed vegetation for screening to the north and west. There being no public comment, this public hearing is closed at 7:23 p.m.

G. McKenna states that there is a buffer issue, he does not know how the applicant could get around that without variances. As to the entrances on South Greenfield Road, if the applicant narrows them up a bit and keeps them within the property lines that will be fine; they are needed for fire exits. The number of parking spaces is also discussed. G. McKenna states that the required buffer would be 30' against a residence. G. Dake explains that the ZBA is the only body that can vary that requirement. C. Baker states that he has spoken with K. Manz regarding the septic system and there is apparently a detailed design but he does not have a copy yet; K. Manz mentioned that he had talked with the DOH about the water supply and it is not considered to be a public water supply, so C. Baker has asked K. Manz to provide a letter documenting the conversation with the DOH; he has suggested that the Planning Board get a copy of the DEC sign-off letter for the fuel tank removals certifying that the site is clean; any discussion related to trash removal and exterior lighting. G. Dake asks Pam Young to comment on the public water supply issue. P. Young states that in this case, the definition would be either if it is an office building with 25 or more employees, 4 or more days a week, 4 or more hours a day or having 25 transient people during the day drinking the water they would need a public water supply. She states that she is not sure if the medical side of DOH would have other information or involvement. That does not come under her area of expertise. T. Yasenach states that she likes the plantings and thinks it will look great, G. McKenna covered her question regarding the porches on South Greenfield Road, and she questions signage. J. Peacock states that she is very impressed with the signs at the Town Hall and the Community Center, so her intent is to place an identical sign in the front green space area and she would like to place an additional sign beneath the porch. She states that zoning calls for a 10 square foot sign and she anticipates needing a variance as she may be somewhere in the area of 20 square feet. T. Siragusa questions the runoff from the parking area being collected on the lot and what will flow into the road. C. Sableski explains three 8' diameter, 8' deep drywells will be set up for the water collection and also for melting snow. He explains the current flow of the runoff and states that it will be interrupted by the drywells. C. Baker states that this is less than 1 acre and does not fall under the Phase II storm water regs. What the applicant is proposing is above and beyond what exists and will be an improvement. J. Streit states that he would be in favor of this given the green space and that the engineering issues can be solved. L. Dupouy questions the trash removal and what is in place for HAZMAT materials. J. Peacock states that she has to set up contracts and talk with trash removal companies specifically about the removal of the HAZMAT material in addition to a small trash container. L. Dupouy asks about exterior lighting. C. Sableski states that there will be lighting off the building but they have not discussed if the hours will demand post lighting and J. Peacock states that she would like any post lighting to shine downward for the comfort of the neighbors and does not anticipate that they will be running other than just lights for security of the building after 8:30 at night. L. Dupouy states that she would like to see what is proposed and also what arrangements are made for trash removal. M. Thrailkill states that it is exciting and he is all for it. J. Peacock states that she did have a professional designer come in and take a look at the town center and look at the appropriate colors. She has decided that more of a putty color fits in with the country setting.

August 8, 2006

M. Thraikill states that it would be nice to have the lights really dim at night, some of his other questions have been answered and he still questions the medical water issue. J. Peacock states that she will speak with the DOH about this. K. Manz states that he did call the DOH, spoke with M. Shaw and J. Meacham and he will document that to C. Baker. He reiterates what Pam Young stated. They also stated that since there is only 70' to the well, that the furthest they could get the septic system away would be permissible. They said basically to mitigate it as best they can and K. Manz states that they have done that by doing UV disinfection of the water system, that is on the septic design and will be on the site plan as well. He states that it is 100-feet to the neighbors well, just barely, and 140' to the neighbor to the south. G. Dake states that the applicant understands where the Board is coming from on the water supply and he is not sure that this Board has to be that concerned about this as that will come under DOH inspection. G. Dake states that on commercial projects the Board does ask for some sort of a lighting plan; the applicant needs to address the buffer issue; the question of trash disposal is one that needs a little more discussion. J. Streit states that he had 8 physicians in the building he worked in and they had no exterior container for trash. The cleaning people removed the trash every night. C. Sableski states that the applicant might want to consider a small compactor also. T. Yasenchak reiterates that she likes the project, but is concerned with snow removal. C. Sableski states that they will be piling it over the tanks so that as it melts it will be taken care of. Discussion takes place that snow may also have to be removed from the site.

SCOTT FORO – Site Plan Review

Whispering Pines, Sand Hill Road

Scott and Kim Foro are present. C. Baker states that he received the plans, a cover letter from D. Myers, and a traffic report prepared by D. Myers. Regarding the traffic report, it concludes that there is a sight distance issue here based on the existing non-posted speed limit. He states that he believes that we discussed requesting having the speed limit reduced here. A letter was sent to the Town Board. C. Baker states that D. Myers determination was basically by his comfort level of driving and that what we really need to see is something a little bit more measured – either a speed count or some type of study. Based on what D. Myers has presented, this does not meet at 40 mph and if the travel speed is higher, it is going to be worse. G. Dake asks W. Barss if the traffic counter tracks speed as well as the number of vehicles. W. Barss states that it does and that they can set up the counter this week. S. Foro comments on the discussion regarding no left turn at the entrance, which would eliminate the problem with the sight distance which is to the right. C. Baker states that D. Myers gave three recommendations to improve the sight distance, one being reducing the speed limit, one is control the turning and the third is to remove vegetation, which apparently some is not on the applicant's property and there may be an issue with that. C. Baker states that he is recommending that if the final report recommends that the vegetation has to be removed to meet the AASHTO requirements, then it will be the applicant's responsibility to somehow get that done because the Town does not have any more right to do it than the applicant at that point. This will all be determined by the final traffic report. C. Baker states that in D. Myers cover letter he explains that the waste water system and water system will be under NYS DOH jurisdictional review, and C. Baker does not disagree with that and has no problem with letting his review default to DOH, but he would like to see any comments that DOH might have on the septic system design and water system. Regarding the storm water run-off, the amount of disturbance is calculated to be less than one acre so it does not fall under the Phase II jurisdictional requirements. There is an erosion control plan which does include silt fence and appears to protect the adjoining wetlands and neighboring ponds, and appears adequate to C. Baker. He states that his last comment has to do with buffering to neighboring properties and he did not see anything on the plans to preserve any no cut areas along those neighboring properties. He suggests that be considered. G. McKenna states that C. Baker has addressed all of his questions and asks if the Foro's are operating this under a Use Variance. S. Foro states that it was. M. Thraikill states that he is in favor of the project and that a key point is the traffic report and that a professional traffic report with findings would be prudent right now. He also comments on the buffering with neighbors. S. Foro states in the one area there is 100' of buffer to the property line and then there is probably an additional 200' to the neighbor's home. J. Streit questions the east septic layout and whether

August 8, 2006

there is a zoning issue. G. McKenna states that there is a rule, but it is a State rule, they are far enough away and that will have to be approved by DOH. T. Siragusa asks what G. McKenna meant by his question regarding the Use Variance. G. McKenna explains and states that he is looking in the Code Book for the answer. G. Dake states that the question is whether we are expanding on a Use Variance. Use Variance approval letter is in the file and G. Dake reads from it. G. McKenna states that it will be fine. T. Yasenchak states that the engineering information does not indicate the exact amount of clearing and grading, and that was asked to be in the report. S. Foro states that the sites were there but not really used. K. Foro states that the basic clearing was done years ago. S. Foro states that the clearing to be done will be for septic and shower buildings, the sites were cut in and over grown a little. G. Dake asks how long the campgrounds had been defunct when the Foro's took it over? S. Foro states 5 years. J. Streit asks if the site is walkable and suggests a site walk. The Board discusses this and individuals will contact S. Foro to visit the site. S. Foro indicates that some of the area is not driveable. T. Yasenchak states that if it is not driveable, then the applicant will have to grade and that should be included in the engineer's report. S. Foro indicates that he drives his 4-wheel drive through there, but would not drive a car in there. S. Foro asks about the sight distance and putting up a no left turn sign. G. Dake states that D. Myers is not a traffic engineer but stated it was unsafe, if the Planning Board ignores this and allows increased traffic, they would be negligent in their responsibilities. D. Myers' suggested remedies are conditioned upon this being a 40 mph speed limit, which it is not yet. Sand Hill is not Daniels Road or Locust Grove Road as far as traffic goes. The Board has to decide. What has been done in the past is that the Board has been pretty stringent on making sure that we are not opening the Town to liability and where there is going to be an intersection, we are going to make sure that we have adequate sight distance as certified by a traffic engineer. The Board consensus is that they would like to see a traffic engineer report as there will be increased traffic, and there is the opportunity to get actual traffic and speed data for what behavior actually is. Discussion takes place regarding other cases where this type of situation has occurred. C. Baker suggests, if they have not already done so, to get their information to DOH as quickly as possible as they could be waiting a couple of months for that. S. Foro states that he had wanted to get started on the electrical work and asks if he can do that without Planning Board approval. G. Dake suggests he speak with G. McKenna about what exactly he can do in that respect. G. Dake reiterates that the Board likes the campground, has no problem with the use to the extent that engineering issues can be resolved, and any work being done on the electric, – the applicant is proceeding at his own risk. Further discussion takes place regarding how to mitigate the sight distance issues.

FRANK FLANAGAN – Site Plan Review

Middle Grove Road

Frank and Patty Flanagan are present. G. McKenna states that this property is in the RD zone and does not require a vegetative buffer, other than the standard setbacks for the buildings. C. Baker states that engineering issues have been resolved, and suggests that the applicant be asked to update the Planning Board in the future as his plans for permanent structures come together. G. McKenna explains that the applicant will need building permits unless he files for Ag exemptions and then he will not need building permits for any agricultural buildings. L. Dupouy asks if there is a way to give the applicant approvals now for the pole barns to make it more efficient. G. Dake states that he believes that C. Baker's comments were directed at anything that is not on this current site plan map. C. Baker agrees.

RESOLUTION – F. Flanagan, Site Plan Review

MOTION: L. Dupouy

SECOND: M. Thrailkill

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants Site Plan approval and Special Use Permit to Frank and Patty Flanagan for a horseback riding area on property located at 95 Middle Grove Road, TM# 151.-1-27.1

August 8, 2006

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

Noes: None

Absent: Cochran, Young

G. Dake asks P. Young to comment on the water supply – they are using porta potties, there is no drinking water supplied, there is no permanent facility. P. Young reiterates her previous comments that if no water is being provided, and they will not have 25 or more people drinking water from the site, this would not be regulated by DOH. If he were doing a septic system, that would be regulated. P. Flanagan reiterates that she was told 25 or more people for 60 consecutive days then they would require a public water system.

MICHAEL HICKAM – Major Subdivision

Medbury Road

Michael Hickam and Kurt Bedore are present. K. Bedore states that he has submitted revised plans, a short form SEQRA, and a drainage investigation report; they have met with C. Baker and W. Barss to talk about the cul-de-sac issue. He states that the engineering cost estimate is still outstanding. K. Bedore states that he has done perc tests to gather information, but that C. Baker has not been present. He feels that the on-site soils are suitable for shallow trench systems. In general, he states that they are finding highly variable soils on site. G. Dake asks W. Barss if he has come to an agreement with the applicant regarding the cul-de-sac diameter. W. Barss states that they have not come to an agreement; that the applicant was going to have some engineering done to see how big he could get it and then they would further discuss it. K. Bedore explains what they have looked at and done to this point, and gives W. Barss a copy of the plans. C. Baker states that he is unsure how to proceed and reviews that everyone is aware of the situation, he has spoken with W. Barss about this, we need a plan of action that the deficiencies will be repaired and that the Board is agreeable with. He states that it is his understanding that the underdrain system will be totally replaced. K. Bedore states that was his recommendation, he thinks some are working, but just to be sure that is the conservative approach. C. Baker states that his concern or question at this time is what comments, if any, DOH is going to have. They are relatively small lots and if they are going to be shallow fill systems it may be difficult to meet the current separations as they are enforcing the 150' separation, which became effective in November 2005. That may have an impact on the number of lots or the layout of the lots. He states that he is anxious to see DOH become involved with this. G. Dake asks if we are far enough along that M. Shaw will talk to the applicant. C. Baker states that he believes that we are, the cul-de-sac issue still needs to be resolved and he asks what the size of the cul-de-sac is now. K. Bedore states that the radius is 75' and the diameter is 150'. W. Barss states that he would like to talk with C. Baker about this. G. Dake states that perhaps they could look at doing an alternative design with an off set. K. Bedore states that he would provide a turning analysis. C. Baker states that W. Barss needs to be involved with any discussion and the Highway Department will make the decisions. He thinks we are at a point where we need to get some test borings done and have a soil scientist present. G. Dake goes over three key issues he has – cul-de-sac diameter; drainage; well/septic review by DOH. T. Yasenchak states that she believes we had asked for the long form SEQRA. C. Baker states that DOH will require the long form. L. Dupouy states that when the site visit was done, she thought that the cul-de-sac had been discussed, and that she thought it was not going to be an issue as long as the Town trucks could plow and get around it. G. Dake states that he believes that the discussion had been that it looked like it was workable and W. Barss has told M. Hickam that he is willing to work with him. Discussion has also taken place that the applicant may need to lose a lot because the cul-de-sac needs to be expanded. There is also the question of how this impacts with the storm water management system, the road, ditch lines, catch basins, etc. M. Thraillkill agrees with G. Dake's three issues and states that he would like to see this move forward and encourages the Town to bend a little. He felt, from the site walk, that the cul-de-sac is in there, the electrical is in there, can we use a smaller truck to plow the thing? T. Siragusa asks if the question of the radius is a comfort thing or for emergency vehicles? G. Dake states that he thinks is a plowing issue and it is not in the code anywhere. It has always been a Highway Department issue. W. Barss states that the Town has a lot of little cul-de-sacs and larger trucks which make it harder to

August 8, 2006

plow. He states that in a large storm, they can go around once and come back later to clean it up. The Town continues to grow and we are gaining a lot more roads. J. Streit questions if a plow truck takes more room than a fire truck. W. Barss states yes. G. Dake reminds everyone that the Planning Board can approve anything they want, but only the Town Board can accept a Town road. K. Bedore asks if he should present this to the Town Board. G. Dake suggests that the applicant wait until W. Barss has looked at this and see if he is ok with it. If the Highway Superintendent says that he can live with the cul-de-sac, G. Dake states that he would be shocked if the Town Board did not agree. G. Dake states that getting answers to the engineering questions is going to be such a big issue on this whole thing. K. Bedore states that he does not see how he can go any further with his assessment on the drainage system. C. Baker states that he would be hesitant to make a recommendation until we know what the actual layout will be and until we get input from DOH. M. Hickam asks how losing a lot will help with the cul-de-sac issue. G. Dake states that it might not and comments that with the rezoning, he would like to see this get as far as possible.

KENNETH & CHERYL WOLFE – Minor Subdivision

Hughes Road and Barney Road

Kenneth Wolfe and Kim Crocetta, Attorney, are present. K. Crocetta explains that the applicant owns approximately 28+ acres in the Town of Greenfield and part of the lot extends into the Town of Providence; there is access and frontage on both Hughes and Barney Roads. They would like to subdivide this into 4 lots and meet the acreage and frontage. She states that initially they had a concern for the parcel that crosses the Providence line and is where K. and C. Wolfe have their residence, but after being apprised of a survey from 1979, it seems that where the residence is positioned, there is approximately 8 acres. K. Crocetta states that there are current septic and wells with the residence and the mobile home; there is a minor brook that runs through the property, but that should not present an issue with any septic or well design for the two upper parcels bordering Barney Road; there doesn't seem to be any concern with wetlands but the Wolfe's will be hiring a surveyor. K. Crocetta comments that there should be no change to the neighborhood as these will each meet code and be 8 acres. G. Dake questions the differences in the maps labeled 'BEFORE' and 'AFTER'. K. Wolfe explains that there was a property transaction in 1999. G. Dake states that then the current conditions are what appear on the map labeled 'AFTER'. G. Dake asks G. McKenna what issues, other than going to Saratoga County, are presented by the fact that the house is on a parcel that crosses the town lines. G. McKenna states that he does not know that it matters too much other than notifying Providence and he thinks that if that lot in total is 8 acres, and there is a note added to the plat that it will not be re-subdivided, he does not see a problem with that. G. McKenna states that the Greenfield tax map showing adjoining towns indicates that the portion in the Town of Providence is 2.87 acres. K. Wolfe states that on his survey it states that the total is 32.3 acres plus or minus. G. Dake states that any approvals would be based on a survey map. J. Streit asks about slopes on the property. K. Wolfe states that it is level coming off of Barney Road and then there is a ravine between the proposed lots. G. Dake states that the issues here will be minimum lot size; wetland establishment and/or certified streams and generally, as normal practice, the wetlands are flagged or a no disturbance line is required on the plans; sight distance. K. Wolfe's daughter questions that this section of Barney Road is going to be maintained. W. Barss states that the Town has always plowed to the turn around. K. Wolfe states that it used to be plowed all the way to the Providence line years ago. M. Thrailkill asks how far the turn around is. W. Barss states about ½ mile. G. Dake states that this is a Town road. W. Barss states that it would take an extreme amount of work and money to put this back to a real town road. He states that there are a number of issues including stream crossings. G. Dake will call Mark Schachner to discuss this and states that he has heard that where the town owns a road, and where people move down a road that is officially a town road, there is some obligation, but he has not heard that from anyone official. G. Dake states that it does meet the requirement for frontage because it is officially a Town road. K. Wolfe states that the two proposed lots with frontage on Barney Road are only accessible from Barney Road. A map with topo is going to be key. T. Yasenach questions that when the property transaction took place in 1999, why was the eastern line drawn with the little box cut out? K. Wolfe explains that there was a 9-acre exemption that he tracked back to the 21st Allotment of the

August 8, 2006

Kayaderosseras Patent in the 1800's and it has something to do with an artesian well. G. Dake states that we do not have enough information to ask for Lead Agency, but that the Town of Providence should be notified of this application. Question is raised regarding the mobile home and K. Wolfe states that it has been there since 1990 and is in use. G. Dake states that this action will bring this into conformance, taking two primary residences on one lot and separating the residences into their own lots. The Board consensus is that they would like a good map with topo and they have no other issues at this time. G. Dake asks W. Barss how bad the road is. W. Barss states that it is a one-lane road that looks like a logging road.

DAVID EVANS – Lot Line Adjustments/ Minor Subdivision

Plank Road

D. Evans is present. G. Dake explains that getting the information packet helped him to understand what the applicant is proposing and what the end product will be. He states that it could, for him, take the whole frustrating issue of what happened to that piece in the middle and make it moot, because he does not care once he knows what it is turning into. He refers to map on page 1 and to the 5-year rule regarding no further subdivision. T. Yasenchak agrees that it was very helpful to see this as a whole; she does not see a problem, we know that the land is restricted because of the slopes, the topo; she thinks having keyhole lots allows it to stay naturally wild, it would be hard to put a road in there and it would just make it more dense. T. Siragusa questions what has changed. G. Dake states that he saw some of this in advance, he stopped looking at the process and looked at the end product but he is unsure how to make it happen. M. Thrailkill asks what page 5 is. D. Evans states that it was suggested that he look at this as a project for a public road so he attempted to do that on the last two pages, but his conclusion is that it is not dense enough to pay for a public road. G. Dake states that he found reading D. Evans' thought process in advance along with the maps to be helpful and it made it simpler. J. Streit asks if the Board approves this, it is someone else's problem what they do with it? How it gets developed? G. Dake states not necessarily, just like any other subdivision with lots of this size you do not necessarily have to pin someone down to where they put their house or driveway. J. Streit asks about future subdivisions. G. Dake states that anyone wishing to subdivide would have to come back to the Planning Board and the project would be looked at under the current zoning. D. Evans states that he has an interested developer and that he has held off on selling because of the lot line adjustments and they were waiting to see the new zoning. G. Dake states that he would love to have this project finished. T. Siragusa states that he does not see why the lot line adjustments are necessary. D. Evans explains that he is attempting to get enough frontage for the keyhole lots and that the surveyor has reduced those further. C. Baker states that he does not have issues with septic or well as the lots are large enough and he is sure that there is plenty of area to find a location; the driveways – they are going to be steep but he does not typically look at driveways on residential lots. G. Dake asks G. McKenna to take a look at the plans to see that it meets code. G. McKenna states that from just looking at it here briefly, it looks like there are a lot of driveways crossing the five-acre parcel. D. Evans states that if you look at page 3, there is information on the proposed road/shared driveway. G. McKenna states that if each of the keyhole lots has 40' of frontage and complies with the keyhole regs, they are legal and the lots are large enough. T. Yasenchak comments that deed language will be required. She asks where the buildable area would be on the 5-acre lot with the two driveways crossing it. D. Evans points that area out. G. Dake asks C. Baker to do an engineering review. G. Dake states that specific deed language would be required in addition to reviewing the long form SEQRA and making any necessary changes, and the Planning Board may be able to reaffirm their decision on that. He suggests that the Board attempt to craft the approval language to be something that would include the lot line adjustments and the subdivision per a specific dated map. The map needs to be checked for the standard notes, keyhole driveway note, and deed language specific to this easement. A public hearing is scheduled for August 29, 2006 at 7:00 p.m. G. Dake states that the map and information in the file is sufficient for the public to see that two lots are being created, easements, etc. D. Evans questions that two new lots are being created, as opposed to a lot line and creating one new lot. G. Dake states that is something that the Board needs to review, in addition to G. McKenna – how many lots, how many lot line adjustments, etc.

August 8, 2006

AIRTRICITY – Site Plan Review

Lake Desolation

No one is present representing this application. G. Dake reviews the applications and states that we need a site plan and that the application will require a SWPPP. C. Baker states that if we compare this to what we did for the cell tower, we had a detailed site plan showing the access road, limits of disturbance, etc. Storm water management is discussed.

DISCUSSION

C. Baker states that Alec Stephens is working on the road at Moss Creek, and there is no bond in place. C. Baker spoke with A. Janik, who has spoken with M. Schachner and A. Stephens, and they have reached an agreement where they are comfortable to allow A. Stephens to proceed.

G. Dake has a map showing the properties of Saratoga PLAN. In Greenfield they indicate Bucket Pond, the Locust Grove Preserve, the Carver Farm, Bruchac's Ndaminna, Bell Brook and the Greenfield Preserve for a total of 326 acres.

Meeting adjourned 9:43 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary