

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

SEPTEMBER 12, 2006

REGULAR MEETING

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

AUGUST 29, 2006 MINUTES

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: M. Thraikill

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and accepts the minutes of August 29, 2006 as submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Cochran, Dupouy, Streit, Thraikill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Dake, Siragusa

PLANNING BOARD CASES

TIMOTHY KAHL – Minor Subdivision

Sand Hill Road

Timothy Kahl is present. A public hearing is opened at 7:02 p.m. T. Kahl explains that he would like to subdivide his property into three lots – one of 5.49 acres; one of 10.12 acres with his existing house and one of 19.166 acres. There being no public comment, this public hearing is closed at 7:03 p.m.

T. Yasenchak reviews what T. Kahl was asked to add to the map and C. Baker states that the applicant has done what was asked. D. Cochran asks C. Baker if the applicant needs to have anything on the plans regarding compliance with the NY State energy code. C. Baker states that is for the building permit, not the subdivision plans. **The Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered “no”. M. Thraikill makes a motion to check Box B, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impacts. D. Cochran seconds the motion. All present in favor.**

RESOLUTION – T. Kahl, Minor Subdivision

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: M. Thraikill

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board approves the minor subdivision request of Timothy Kahl for property located at 615 Sand Hill Road, TM# 137.-1-51.121 as submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Cochran, Dupouy, Streit, Thraikill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Dake, Siragusa

September 12, 2006

EDWARD LOWMAN – Minor Subdivision

Hyspot Road

Edward Lowman is present. A public hearing is opened at 7:14 p.m. The applicant explains that he would like to split the property in half and that his map will not be ready for approximately 6 weeks. There being no public comment, this public hearing is closed at 7:16 p.m.

T. Yasenchak states that there is not much that the Board can do until they see the map. J. Streit asks about existing zoning. T. Yasenchak states that it is within zoning according to G. McKenna's notes. E. Lowman will submit the map when completed and be placed on an agenda.

ADIRONDACK ADVENTURES – Site Plan Review

Brigham Road

M. Leahy is present for this application and explains that the campground would like to put in a 9-hole golf course, about 10,000 square feet, hopefully with a couple of fountains. T. Yasenchak reviews G. McKenna's notes that this is in an R-4 zone. J. Streit asks how far this is from the road. M. Leahy states that it is 300 – 400 yards from the road. T. Yasenchak asks if G. McKenna told M. Leahy if this was an accessory use to the campground or a recreational use. M. Leahy states recreational. M. Thraikill asks about houses bordering this area. M. Leahy explains where the pool is located, etc. and that this area is bordered by a stonewall and a lot of trees. He states that he has a 50' offset from the next property. This would be only for the campers, they do not anticipate opening this to the public. M. Thraikill asks about lighting. M. Leahy states that they would like to have low lighting to shine inside the golf course. D. Cochran asks about neighbors. M. Leahy points out homes and states that the neighbors have been allowed to use the pool and have been told about the proposed golf course. L. Dupouy states that she once managed a miniature golf course and asks about rules pertaining to the fountains and the dyes in the water. M. Leahy states he would follow any guidelines and that he personally does not like the dyes. Regarding wildlife, etc., he states that they would follow any guidelines necessary. L. Dupouy asks if M. Leahy will be creating this. M. Leahy states that he will be building it himself and this is what he did for a living before running this campground. M. Thraikill states that he would like to see a better map, the whole site plan with the house locations, etc. M. Leahy states that they have 85 acres and he is not sure how he would get a map showing the neighbors. C. Baker asks if a site plan map is in order. T. Yasenchak reads from G. McKenna's notes regarding buffers. Discussion takes place regarding the need for a better map. T. Yasenchak states that the Board will need to speak with G. McKenna regarding this and that his notes state that R4 does not require a vegetative buffer and that the applicant is proposing a 50' buffer. Board discusses whether this is for a special use permit or just a site plan for an accessory use. A public hearing is discussed and set for September 26th. T. Yasenchak asks for a better map of the property, perhaps showing where the golf course is and where the neighbor's homes are located. M. Thraikill states that he does not believe we need a survey map and asks if the applicant would be ok with the Planning Board members visiting the site. M. Leahy states any time.

MICHAEL HICKAM – Major Subdivision

Medbury Road

Michael Hickam and Kurt Bedore are present. D. Cochran recuses himself. K. Bedore states that to date they have not revised the plans and so are working off of the July plans. The reason for that was that they wanted to hold off on revising the plans yet again until they new a little bit more definitively that the project was going to continue to progress. From the July meeting they had to schedule soil test pits and that was a challenge to get the 4 different reviewing parties together. He states that the date for the test pits was also the submission deadline for this board meeting. He states that their intentions are to revise the plans

September 12, 2006

accordingly including any comments they may receive tonight as well as the Town Engineer's comments and get them back by next week for the next Planning Board meeting. He submits a letter regarding C. Baker's comment letter of 9/7/06. He states that they confirmed, by the test pits, that the septic systems would be suitable as proposed, either conventional or in some instances shallow trench or fill systems. Not raised beds, but slight fill systems to meet the separation requirements. They have sent a set of plans to M. Shaw, DOH, who has given back verbal comments; they will be meeting with him to meet his requirements and they will copy the town on M. Shaw's comments. To date the comments have been administrative in nature. Regarding C. Baker's 9/7/06 letter, he states that tonight he submitted a letter from Alton Knapp describing how the wetlands were delineated. T. Yasenchak states that she believes that the wetland areas were substantially down grade. K. Bedore states that they will indicate the area of disturbance and right now their best estimate is approximately 7-acres. He states that they will prepare a construction cost estimate and submit it to the Town for the basis for the performance bond. T. Yasenchak asks C. Baker if that is going to be the same process or reviewing the catch basins before setting a cost? K. Bedore states that is further in the letter. Item 4 of C. Baker's letter is discussed regarding pavement requirements and K. Bedore asks if this is the current Town standard or forthcoming. C. Baker states that is what has been required on the last 6 subdivisions that have been approved, it is the current standard that the Board has been asking for. K. Bedore asks if this project could be grandfathered to cut down on construction costs. C. Baker's recommendation is that we stick to it because we have required it of every developer who has come before us for the last year and a half or so. T. Yasenchak states that ultimately, it does affect the future maintenance of the road, how long the road will last, etc. K. Bedore states that he will revise that and that the cul-de-sac issue has been resolved to a point. W. Barss provided the applicant with a written letter, which K. Bedore reads, stating that he has approved the cul-de-sac proposed by M. Hickam to be 75' radius. C. Baker asks if this is for the right-of-way radius. K. Bedore states that he will check on that. W. Barss states that he was under the impression that the 75' was the roadway radius. K. Bedore checks the plans and states that the pavement diameter is approximately 122' and the right-of-way is 150'. K. Bedore states that it currently is less than 120'. K. Bedore states that if they push the right-of-way line another 30' that would force the relocation of the electrical lines. This will be discussed further by W. Barss and the applicant. The road profile near the entrance with Medbury Road needs to be revised to show the minimum required slope on the road. Regarding the storm sewer, K. Bedore states that the drainage system is flat in some cases, originally constructed as a dewatering system, and it is his observation that the system is operating adequately and there is no build up. He states that they will be adding additional structures to straighten out some of the pipes. K. Bedore asks, because the system was originally installed as a dewatering system, can the pipes that have very slight pitches remain as such. He refers to the plans and states that where they showed zero or level pitch, it is actually very, very slight. If the Town requires something towards approaching Town standards, then they will be forced to completely reinstall the whole system. He asks the Board and C. Baker what exactly can they accept in the system, obviously the pipes that are negatively pitched have to be taken out and it is clear from the comment letter that no pitch is not acceptable. C. Baker states that his concern is that once the road is completed, there will be more drainage going into the system and the flat pipes will collect the sediment making it very difficult for the Town to maintain. The Highway Superintendent has made the comment that they cannot maintain the catch basins they have now other than going down inside them with a shovel and bucket to clean them out. It is very labor intensive. The concern is with flat pipes that the only way to clean them out is with high-pressure jetting or that type of thing, and bring crews in to do that because the Town does not have the equipment to do it. C. Baker states that he has to stick with the recommendation that storm sewer pipes are designed with a minimum percent of grade to be self-cleaning. K. Bedore states that he understands the rationale behind that and wishes he had known that earlier because he was lead to believe that some of these sub-par to the Town standard conditions might be acceptable. With that requirement, it would appear to him that the system would need to be completely rebuilt and reinstalled. C. Baker states that one thing he would consider is that there are very large pipes in there – 18", 24" - and in his opinion, he does not think that they need that large a pipe for this size subdivision. They could look at that and there could be some savings there, rather than putting 24" pipes back in, they might not necessarily have to do that. There might be ways to save some sections by going to smaller pipes. L. Dupouy asks if the applicant's engineer and C. Baker should be discussing the issues from the review letter. C. Baker states that the Board's input on

September 12, 2006

some of this is important based on the history of this project. He has stated his position as the Town Engineer, but if the Planning Board thinks something different they should have the right to vote and he encourages their input. M. Thraillkill states that in this particular case he would go with C. Baker's recommendation. T. Yasenchak states that if this were to be under private ownership, such as a HOA, she would be more open to having some options because then it would not be the Town's responsibility. From what C. Baker says, and W. Barss is here, the Town doesn't seem to have the equipment to clean this out appropriately without spending money to clean it adequately, so that would put more of a burden on the budget of the Highway Superintendent. J. Streit states that the Board is to protect the Town and C. Baker speaks to the Town's standards, so the Board would have to honor that. K. Bedore comments on the road and the drainage system would have to belong to the HOA, and they would have to explore that. He states that the rest of the comments are pretty technical in nature and he believes they can be easily addressed. T. Yasenchak states that the long form will be reviewed when revised plans are received. C. Baker states that he is not sure if we have sent Lead Agency letters out. Discussion takes place about the storm water basin management. T. Yasenchak reads from G. McKenna's notes asking who is going to own the open space, is there going to be a HOA, is it going to be given to Saratoga PLAN or joined to a specific lot? M. Hickam states that he was going to retain ownership of the open space. T. Yasenchak states that then that will be joined to his current lot. M. Hickam states it will and there were no plans for a HOA. T. Yasenchak states that the plans would need to reflect that it would not be a separate lot. G. McKenna's notes state that in his opinion, the cul-de-sac should comply with the current Town standards. T. Yasenchak states that if the Lead Agency letters have not been sent out, they will be and that a public hearing will be set for September 26th at 7:00 p.m. M. Hickam states that he thought the cul-de-sac issue had been taken care of and that they have laid it out as large as they can without destroying any infrastructure that exists.

ARLENE & RAYMOND DICKSON – Minor Subdivision

Spier Falls Road

Raymond Dickson is present and states that he has property of less than 4-acres on Spier Falls Road that he would like to subdivide to give his son a lot to build a modular home. The portion he would give to his son is less than 2 acres and will require an area variance. R. Dickson asks if the drainage easement takes away from his property. T. Yasenchak explains that it does not take away from the acreage, it just allows access. R. Dickson explains that part of the reason for the configuration is the location of his leach field. T. Yasenchak explains that before the Planning Board can approve anything, the applicant needs to get the variance. D. Cochran asks about a new survey map. Applicant states he will be getting that. D. Cochran suggests having the new proposed house location, dimensions, well, etc. on the survey map. C. Baker suggests the applicant may want to wait to do this until after the variance. T. Yasenchak states that after the November ZBA meeting, if the variance application is approved, she suggests he then get the surveyor to put the additional notes and information on plans.

DISCUSSION

C. Baker states that he received an estimate for the construction costs from C. T. Male for the bond for J. Witt's subdivision. He states that there were a couple of items missing and he could not get a hold of the engineer to get those included. The estimate is \$479,100. He states that typically the Town Engineer reviews the amount and either agrees with it or makes suggestions. As he stated, there are a couple of items he wants to see added such as SWPPP inspections and possibly a unit price for some rock excavation in case they run into that. The Town Board needs to accept the bond amount before J. Witt can actually file the paperwork and he is anxious to start construction. He still does not have approval from the DOH, etc., but he wants to get the contractor in there and start construction for the Showcase of Homes. C. Baker states that he does not know if the Planning Board can make the recommendation to the Town Board right now based on this preliminary amount being increased by the Town Engineer's suggestions. He states that he thinks that

September 12, 2006

G. Dake wanted to take the opportunity to inform the Town Board that this is coming their way and we can keep J. Witt moving on schedule. C. Baker suggests that the Board might be able to draft a letter to the Town Board stating that we have a preliminary estimate and that the Town Engineer is in agreement with it, with the exception of a few items which will be discussed with the applicant's engineer. He states that it will be closer to \$500,000, total. T. Yasenchak asks if anyone has any comments and states that she is fine with that. L. Dupouy states that the applicant knew this was going to be challenging from the beginning, and just because he is rushing now that doesn't automatically put a rush on the Planning Board. The rush is on him to comply with what was set forth. He knew that there were going to be a lot of issues with the grading, so until C. Baker can tell the Planning Board that he is 100% comfortable with that grading, she does not want J. Witt's rush to force the Planning Board. She states that she is in favor of this project, but the applicant is creating issues. He knew from the beginning that he was going to do the Showcase of Homes and it is incumbent upon him to meet that, not for the Planning Board to adjust to meet that for him. She reiterates that she does not want the Planning Board to be rushed in any way to compromise their integrity and make sure that it is the right amount of money. J. Streit asks if this is a matter before the Planning Board or is it a matter for the Town Council. C. Baker explains that the Town Board has to officially approve the bond, but the Planning Board makes the recommendation to the Town Board. J. Streit states that none of the Board members have the expertise to make that decision. T. Yasenchak states the items C. Baker commented on are really kind of minor issues that are outstanding. The applicant still does not have approval, he is not putting the Board over a barrel as far as approving it and the Planning Board has approved it with contingencies, but those contingencies are NYS DOH, etc. Whether or not the Town accepts the Bond, he still does not have his subdivision and he still does not have approval to continue to build on lots until he gets that approval. He is just looking for the Bond and it is just a step. C. Baker states that the bond allows the applicant to proceed with the construction; it allows the Town to go up there and inspect the construction. Without the bond the Town does not do any inspections because we have no protection. L. Dupouy states that at the beginning it took some time to get specific items taken care of and as long as C. Baker is on board, she is on board, but she is not forgetting the history of how things took place. T. Yasenchak states that if the applicant puts up the bond and something happens with the DOH, etc., if he doesn't get the rest of his ducks in order, then he has a really nice driveway.

ZBA REFERRALS

Raymond Dickson, Area Variance – No Planning Board issues.

Meeting adjourned 8:25 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary