

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

OCTOBER 10, 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, Dan Cochran, Michael Thraikill, John Streit and Michael Ginley, Alternate. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer is present. Lorna Dupouy, Thomas Siragusa and Gerry McKenna, Zoning Administrator, are absent.

SEPTEMBER 26, 2006 MINUTES

MOTION: T. Yasenchak

SECOND: M. Thraikill

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and accepts the minutes of September 26, 2006 as submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Cochran, Ginley, Streit, Thraikill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Dupouy, Siragusa

DISCUSSION

G. Dake reminds everyone present that the second meeting of October has been changed from October 31st to October 24th, with the next meeting to be November 14th.

G. Dake congratulates D. Cochran on being awarded a Community Service Award by KAPL for his various community service activities.

PLANNING BOARD CASES

CHATFIELD ROCKWELL CONSTRUCTION – Lot Line Adj.

North Greenfield Road

G. Dake explains that this was an approved lot line adjustment, which was signed, and the time for filing has lapsed.

RESOLUTION - CHATFIELD ROCKWEL, Lot Line Adj.

MOTION: M. Thraikill

SECOND: D. Cochran

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board re-approves the Lot Line Adjustment for property located at 110 North Greenfield Road, TM#125.1-1-24.2 and TM#125.1-1-24.3

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Cochran, Ginley, Streit, Thraikill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Dupouy, Siragusa

October 10, 2006

MICHAEL HICKAM – Major Subdivision

Medbury Road

Michael Hickam and Kurt Bedore are present. D. Cochran recuses himself. J. Streit comments that he recently attended the NYS Planning Federation Conference and that while a member recuses themselves and must sit in the audience; they do have the right to speak on a project as a citizen. K. Bedore states that they are in receipt of C. Baker's 10/10/06 letter and the issues are technical and minor in nature; the DOH review is still in progress; and they will be providing a deed restriction on the open space. G. Dake asks C. Baker for thoughts or comments on the severity of these items. C. Baker states that he believes that they are all relatively minor and he states that one item that the Board has been discussing is how we are going to handle performance bonds and at what point they need to be posted. G. Dake states that he believes that the applicant's plan is to get this to a level of approval and then sell the subdivision, not to subdivide it out himself and do the actual marketing of lots, etc. M. Hickam agrees with this. G. Dake states that this is an excellent point and that there is another project in front of the Board that has an issue, the exact same issue that M. Hickam has, where someone has a subdivision, partially done, and someone is anxious to buy the one house on that lot, but the question becomes, how do we assure that the road gets built? Does it become marketable as a preliminarily approved subdivision? Does it become marketable as an approved with a contingency? M. Hickam states that he believes that a subdivision approval with the contingency would be a better scenario. His intention is to sell it and has been talking with prospective buyers and builders, but now it could easily be next spring before someone buys it. Discussion takes place that when an approval is granted with a contingency, it is not technically approved until the contingency has been met. A time limit for the contingency is discussed. J. Streit questions whether the Board has the ability to extend the 180 days. G. Dake explains that if the 180 days lapses, an applicant has to come back to the Planning Board for reapproval. Possible contingencies are discussed. J. Streit states that at the conference he recently attended, a course presenter stated that it is not a good idea to let one individual or a developer retain the open space around a subdivision and suggested that a HOA should own it. G. Dake states that a constant frustration is what to do with open space. Attaching it to a residence at least says that the person is unlikely to walk away from it. The Board reviews the long form SEQRA for this application. Page 7, question number 20 regarding ambient noise levels was answered as yes. K. Bedore states that this is because of the increase in traffic noise. Part 2 of the long form is reviewed and completed. Impact on Growth and Character – G. Dake explains the conflict between the proposed zoning and the currently adopted Comprehensive Plan, and 'yes' is checked for this item with a small impact.

RESOLUTION – M. Hickam, SEQRA

MOTION: T. Yasenchak

SECOND: M. Ginley

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board checks Box A, that a negative declaration will be prepared on the application of Michael Hickam, Medbury Estates II, TM#137.-1-14.111 for a major subdivision.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Ginley, Streit, Thrailkill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Dupouy, Siragusa

Abstain: Cochran

RESOLUTION – M. Hickam, Major Subdivision

MOTION: M. Thrailkill

SECOND: J. Streit

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants Major Subdivision approval to Michael Hickam, Medbury Estates II, TM#137.-1-14.111, contingent upon:

October 10, 2006

- **Satisfaction of all EDP engineering issues**
- **Putting a road bond being in place**
- **Department of Health approval**
- **This approval is good for 1 year (October 10, 2007)**

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Ginley, Streit, Thraikill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Dupouy, Siragusa

Abstain: Cochran

AIRTRICITY – Site Plan Review

Plank Road, Rear

Bill Wagers is present. A public hearing is opened at 7:28 p.m. and B. Wagers explains that Airtricity would like to put up a 60-meter tall meteorological tower, one mile in from Lake Desolation on the old Plank Road trail. The tower would be there for 1 year for data collection and if necessary, they would ask to extend it for a second year. Bob Hyndman, Denton Road, states that having sat through the original presentation of Airtricity, he is surprised by how small the follow up has become and how modest the initial site plan presentation was as far as the map and site plan. It gives him pause after the initial presentation, and it has become so tiny, so quick. He states that as a resident, it makes him very anxious. There being no further public comment, this public hearing is closed at 7:30 p.m.

G. Dake states that B. Hyndman made a very interesting observation about the presentation. B. Wagers states that this is just for the met tower. C. Baker states that he received the SWPPP; it is in order and satisfies his comments. He states that he has no other engineering concerns at this time, and questions whether a removal bond should be considered as this is a temporary tower. G. Dake states that he is not overly concerned as this is in the middle of nowhere and if the applicant is going to move forward on this project, the Town will have control. There are provisions under the Town code for unsafe structures and their removal. SEQRA is not required on this project.

RESOLUTION – Airtricity, Site Plan Review

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: D. Cochran

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants Site Plan Approval to Airtricity for erection of a 60-meter meteorological tower on property located off of Plank Road, TM#123.-1-10 for one years' duration.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Cochran, Ginley, Streit, Thraikill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Dupouy, Siragusa

SARATOGA POLO – Site Plan Review

Bloomfield Road

Jack Daley, Lisa Nagle, Tim O'Brien, Charles Duvall, and Scott Pellman are present for the application. S. Pellman states that they have reduced the roof height to 38', with the chimney's exceeding that height, and goes on to explain the changes to each of the buildings. J. Streit states that while the cupolas add to the architecture and exceed the height, the aesthetics presented overcome any objections he would have to the absolute mathematical number. Board consensus is that this looks good and the applicant is thanked for making the changes requested. T. Yasenchak states that there is a difference in the way the Town of Greenfield and the State of New York look at building heights, so she understands the confusion.

October 10, 2006

T. O'Brien states that test pits were conducted on site and indicates the locations. He states that they are finalizing the drainage plan and will forward it to C. Baker along with the SWPPP, etc. C. Baker questions the depth of a pond and asks about fencing. T. O'Brien states that it will be 7 to 8 feet and they are looking at landscaping around it and because it is at the end of the field where the horses run off, they have to be very careful what they put there. They are also looking at the pump station and landscaping for that. He states that the Kirby Road survey is not yet completed; the pump station plans are almost complete; they are in discussion with Prestwick Chase regarding fee rates; they have given information to the Sewer District to look at and determine the unit cost, and they are waiting for that reply; the submittal will also include the Kirby Road improvements. The third well was drilled since the last meeting and they may require a fourth well. J. Daley states that they have begun discussions with Prestwick Chase regarding purchasing water from them. G. Dake states that F. McNeary talked to him about that and he thought that was an intriguing proposal. The water would be used for a number of uses including possibly the sprinkler system. C. Baker states that the applicant should keep in mind that there is a storage requirement based on fire protection. Discussion takes place regarding the proposal for County water to come down Bloomfield Road, the amount of work that the applicant has to do and that they are committed to hooking up to it when it comes down. Asking the applicant to develop a tremendous amount of water resources on site to abandon them within a couple of years is a tough thing to ask, but who knows when we will see that County line? G. Dake states that the fire protection and sprinklers that they have added after the fact at the Stewarts' plant all comes out of a pond. He states that the photometrics provided for the lighting do show that they are not going to be shining out onto the Orthwein property. Discussion takes place as to what the applicant will do with the water and sewer with their plan to phase. G. Dake asks if the applicant's intent is to build the sewer line as they build units or are they planning to put in the sewer and water line all in one big fell swoop. L. Nagle states that they had contemplated building in phases for the whole site and building as they go. The road will be built in its entirety all the way around for ingress and egress, but the infrastructure would go along with the building construction as was contemplated in the PUD. T. O'Brien explains how they will run the lines, the direction, etc. G. Dake asks if the applicant is contemplating running sewer up to W. Orthwein's property. J. Daley states that they are contemplating that. T. O'Brien states that they do not have a line going to the property line at this time. They have looked at several scenarios for the future. G. Dake suggests thinking about how you go about this, considering that W. Orthwein owns separate properties, and while he is not planning to sell them today, there is the possibility of future development. C. Baker asks if the applicant is forming a transportation corporation for sewer. G. Dake states that McNeary's is expanding to include this area. L. Nagle states that they are doing one on the Polo property. Discussion takes place that the Polo transportation corporation would need to be expanded if Orthwein wanted to connect, just as Putnam Brook is expanding. C. Dumas states that the problem with trying to anticipate what Orthwein will do is that the applicant is not prepared to bear the costs and time of a PFC approval process to accommodate someone who may never connect. C. Baker asks if the pump station enforcement will be turned over to the Sewer District. T. O'Brien states that he believes it gets turned over to F. McNeary. G. Dake states that Putnam Brook owns their pump station, and he believes they contract with the County for maintenance. T. O'Brien states that he believes someone else does the maintenance and the County reads the meter daily. C. Baker states that his concern is that the Town has talked about this being the only section of town that is within the sewer district, whatever the applicant puts in the road should be sized properly to handle whatever we want it to handle in that area. This is the time to do that. G. Dake states that he had a meeting with Skidmore representatives regarding their master plan and they do not currently have any designs to do anything that would require sewer on their lands, but they acknowledge that the possibility exists. G. Dake states that we should be thinking about the other adjoining vacant land, the possibilities for future development, etc., and the pipe is the cheap part. D. Cochran states that when Prestwick Chase was before the Board, all of this type of thing was discussed. G. Dake states that thought should be given to the ultimate build out and that the applicant should tell the Town how many homes they could handle above and beyond their ultimate build out with the 6" pipe they intend to use. L. Nagle presents the Board with a cross section for Denton Road. She states that they were thinking of, on the North side of Denton Road, an 8' paved pedestrian/bikeway which would have a lane marking, striped separation between it and the travel lane for vehicles. This is something that the plow truck could drop the wing and clear it in the winter. They believe

October 10, 2006

that this would be the most convenient for year-round use. L. Nagle states that if this is what everyone had in mind, they will add this to the plans. C. Dumas states that he has prepared easement language for the adjoining properties for the sewer line and he has forwarded these to Mark Schachner per the discussion with the Planning Board and has not received any feedback. G. Dake asks R. Rowland to check with the Town Attorney. T. Yasenachak asks about signage. L. Nagle states that they are going to do a field stone wall at the main entrance with the logo. The only interior signs would be directional. G. Dake states that we will need to coordinate what happens on Denton Road with the City of Saratoga Springs and he asks W. Barss if he has any thoughts about the culvert, subsurface, etc., between Prestwick Chase and Bloomfield. W. Barss states that the sub-base is terrible and could greatly stand some rebuilding to that area along the location of the culvert. G. Dake states that becomes an issue as to what extent we need to do things on Denton Road. He states that there are some traffic safety issues at the culvert. He would suggest the applicant look at a copy of Skidmore's master plan as part of their presentation addresses the County line that comes down through the location of the County hiking trail line. They are trying to figure out how to connect that with the trail the City is trying to put together. G. Dake states that he wants to think about what our opportunities are, how do we address pedestrian traffic safely on Bloomfield Road, are there things we can do, are there things we can do on the other side of the railroad tracks? He does not know what those opportunities are, but pedestrian traffic between Denton and Daniels is something that is important to the community. The condition of Bloomfield Road is discussed and the fact that it needs to be completely redone. G. Dake states that he is sensitive to the fact that the applicant does not have unlimited finances. They are going to be making a significant impact on traffic and he believes the applicant needs to have a conversation with the Highway Superintendent and the Supervisor. G. Dake states that he initially had wanted the whole road rebuilt, but he is now reconsidering. The applicant has shown good faith and came through when the work was needed on the intersection. A public hearing is discussed and scheduled for October 24, 2006 at 7:00 p.m.

DISCUSSION

Joseph Carbonarro is present and states that he is the purchaser of the showcase house that John Witt has built in the Old Stone Ridge subdivision. He states that they were under contract prior to actually starting the showcase house and have been told for weeks that there would be no trouble getting them in by the end of October. He states that as recently as 48 hours ago, they were told that they would be able to close the week of October 23rd. J. Carbonarro states that he is a project manager and you can't just ask someone if they are going to meet an end date, you have to have some sense that there is a plan. He states that he does not have a sense of that plan and was hoping the Planning Board could enlighten him. G. Dake states that there is currently no subdivision, this lot is not subdivided off of the 80 acres. That is how he got one building permit for one parcel, with one driveway because he also does not have a road bond in place, which is necessary to get the subdivision. The applicant also needs DOH approval to get the subdivision and there may be trouble with some of that. C. Baker states that he spoke with Mike Shaw last week and they are close to obtaining DOH approval. He then sent a letter to Frank Palumbo that the Town still has not received responses to the engineering comments, for which C. Baker wants an item-by-item response. C. Baker believes that a number of those issues have been handled, but it is a matter of going through the motions to respond. J. Carbonarro states that the responses need to be provided, and C. Baker needs to be happy with those responses or he will be owed additional response. G. Dake states there are basic engineering issues; DOH approval, which is outside the Planning Board's control; the Town Board needs to accept the road bond, which J. Witt needs to provide. G. Dake suggests that J. Carbonarro can check with the Town Clerk to see if the appropriate information has been provided and if J. Witt is on the Town Board agenda. G. Dake states that the house also does not have a CO and technically the only reason that house was allowed is because it was one house on one lot. G. Dake states that the Board tried to be as accommodating as they could and agreed to approval with contingencies that would be approved by the Chairman and the Town Engineer so that the applicant would not have to come back to a Board meeting. He states that the Board loved the project, but there are some significant engineering details that needed to be handled. C. Baker states that he and W. Barss have discussed the construction taking place and the fact that until that road bond

October 10, 2006

is in place, the Town has no authority. They see some issues with the rock cut at the beginning of the road that will need to be addressed. G. Dake explains that the ball is in the applicant's court.

C. Baker states that the final plans have been submitted for the Glessing subdivision but they have yet to provide a road bond; the wetland delineation letter has been provided; and the applicant needs to satisfy the Town's requirements for storm water maintenance. C. Baker states that the road bond should be in place before we give final approval, that is the only guarantee that the road bond is going to be there and everything is going to fall into place. C. Baker suggests that we could put a line item in the road bond estimate for the maintenance of the storm water basins, and as we go along if we see that we need more money, prior to the time for dedication, there is time to adjust it. He states that on the Glessing project, we were given an estimate for the maintenance and that could be added to the bond as a line item. M. Thrailkill asks if we should not be approving things until everything is all done? G. Dake states that he does not know that we have done anything that is going to be a problem; applicants don't get anything until the final plans are signed. D. Cochran states that the contingencies put the burden on the applicants to come up with what is required.

G. Dake states that he, the Supervisor, and Deputy Supervisor attended a presentation by Skidmore College on their Master Plan going to the year 2050. This was just a draft with the final version to eventually be presented to the Board of Trustees. They will be meeting with Putnam Brook, the North Side Civic Association, and as part of this process, they have met with the City of Saratoga Springs. Most of what they are talking about has very little practical effect on the Town of Greenfield because all of the land at their main campus is within the City of Saratoga Springs. They are proposing to move the entrance of the new apartments down the hill across from Alpine Ski Shop or into Mr. Washco's driveway, which is technically, legally a road. The properties they own on North Broadway, the Surrey and the Admissions Office, are in the Town of Greenfield, and they are proposing to change the use and someday building on to them to do something. He states that they showed athletic fields where they had previously proposed them on Daniels and Denton; they showed all their holdings; they said these are the things that they are considering, maybe, could be built there someday, but they have no plans to do it. He states that they do say, to maintain the collegial environment, they want to keep as much as they can on their main campus. They do not want to build on the other side of the railroad tracks, because that's just as bad as when they were in Saratoga and one needed to take a bus, take a car, etc. They are trying to promote a pedestrian program and one of the reasons they are talking about moving that access is they are trying to close off more parts of the campus to cars, make it a walking campus on the inside and you just drive around the outside. They are talking about boulevarding North Broadway with a median. That area is maintained by the City of Saratoga Springs. G. Dake states that he thanked them for sharing their plans with the community. He did tell them that he would be happier to see them sell the property on Denton or Daniels Road for housing rather than to have them put up a dormitory or even classrooms, because putting it back on the tax rolls would be nice. They plan to continue the baseball field where it is. The fields that were proposed are now built within the City of Saratoga Springs.

J. Streit asks about the subdivision off Greene Road involving Mr. Ure. G. Dake states that he ran into Dave Godomski, Jelenik Construction, who stated that they are at an impasse and that the applicant is actively exploring what it would take to run a parallel road. G. Dake states that he does not know how much of it is an issue of money or giving up ones privacy.

Meeting adjourned 8:45 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary