

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD**  
**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

**MARCH 6, 2007**

**REGULAR MEETING**

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Zoning Board of Appeals is called to order by Taylor Conard at 7:30 p.m. On roll call the following members are present: Taylor Conard, Michelle Granger, Paul Lunde, Kevin Veitch, and Stanley Weeks. Stefan Strakos, Alternate and Gerry McKenna, Zoning Administrator are absent.

---

**FEBRUARY 6, 2007 MINUTES:**

MOTION: M. Granger

SECOND: S. Weeks

RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals waives the reading of and accepts the minutes of February 6, 2007 as submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Conard, Granger, Lunde, Veitch, Weeks

Noes: None

---

**NEW BUSINESS**

**OLD BUSINESS**

**MATT PARENTEAU – Area Variance, Case #778**

Copperfield Road

Matt Parenteau is present. T. Conard reviews that this is a frontage variance, the applicant has 174.45' and needs 250'.

A public hearing is opened at 7:33 p.m. Joe Mastrianni, Copperfield Road, states that Copperfield Road is all house with no farm animals. His concern is that the existing driveway runs along his property line for about 350'. He states that this driveway is going to have to be larger than for a regular house, more traveled than for a regular house, so he is trying to find ways to mitigate the fact that this is to be more used than he had expected in a residential neighborhood. He is also concerned with the manure, etc., in what is an entirely residential area and that this use doesn't impact his use of his house. There being no further public comments, this public hearing is closed at 7:34 p.m.

T. Conard asks if these horses would be for private use. M. Parenteau states that he has clients who are moving here from Vermont and currently have 4 horses. They want to bring their horses, they are a private stable, they might possibly want to have two more horses for a total of 6 because as the horses get older they want to bring in new ones to replace the ones that will eventually pass on. The prospective owners have three children who compete. The proposed location for the house, septic, barn and manure storage are indicated on the plans. T. Conard asks if they are going to have an area to exercise the horses. M. Parenteau states that they plan on clearing approximately 3 acres and fencing it, in the upper quadrant of the property (NE). P. Lunde asks what is between the two property lines now. M. Parenteau states that it is treed. P. Lunde asks if the driveway is in this location because it is the shortest way across the wetlands.

March 6, 2007

M. Parenteau states that is correct and they were put in 4 or 5 years ago. J. Mastrianni states that the driveway goes to the end of the crossing and not beyond. K. Veitch asks for clarification of ownership. M. Parenteau states that he is a builder and is going to build a home and barn for his clients. M. Parenteau states that as to traffic on the driveway, the only traffic other than normal traffic would be 1 year hay delivery and approximately every 6 to 8 weeks a pickup truck that brings shavings in for the horses. The size of the driveway would not change. T. Conard asks about manure removal. M. Parenteau states that is the plan but the prospective home owner is moving here from Vermont and does not have any contacts here yet. In Vermont she has a local landscaper who hauls away the manure every 6 to 8 weeks. K. Veitch asks what type of horses they are. M. Parenteau states that he is not sure of the breed. K. Veitch questions that they are show horses and there would be some traffic from that. K. Veitch states that horses are allowed in this zone, and that the applicant only needs an area variance for frontage. If the frontage were not an issue the horses would still be allowed to be brought onto the property. P. Lunde states that the only reason they need the variance is for the horses, not to build the house. S. Weeks asks how many acres are required for horses and K. Veitch questions if there is a requirement per horse. R. Rowland states that there is no requirement per horse, and that R1, R2 and R3 require 5 acres for a private stable. M. Granger points out that the subject parcel is almost 20 acres; that the driveway in no way impedes the property line and asks if the proposed barn and manure storage areas are definite. M. Parenteau states that they are 75%, if anything they would push the house location to the south. K. Veitch asks if that would be farther away from the neighbor's property line. M. Parenteau states that eventually it would end up further away from the property line. The barn and the manure storage would stay pretty much where they are indicated. M. Granger states that the variance needs to be contingent upon the plan staying the way it is presented. T. Conard states particularly for the manure storage, but not for the barn. M. Granger states that there is more flexibility in moving the barn, but in terms of the manure storage, where it is located on the plans, seems to be very reasonable in terms of the property and neighboring properties in terms of minimizing any kind of impact to the neighborhood. K. Veitch states that keeping the barn behind the house, at least maintains the visual that all the neighbor would see the side of the house. M. Granger asks if there is any possibility that the clearing would take place on the other side of the house. M. Parenteau states that it would all stay towards the back quadrant. P. Lunde asks if the applicant would be comfortable agreeing to a buffer of so many feet of trees to not be cut on that side of the property. M. Parenteau states that within reason, certainly. P. Lunde suggests a 20' buffer. M. Parenteau states absolutely. M. Granger states that buffer would be next to lot 19 and she states that she would like the variance to reflect the area to be developed as the back quadrant and not closer to the neighbors,. K. Veitch asks if they are staying in that area because it is the highest point. M. Parenteau states that it is higher and flatter, and he does not anticipate Skidmore developing the property to the east.

#### **RESOLUTION – M. Parenteau, Area Variance**

MOTION: M. Granger

SECOND: K. Veitch

RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals grants an area variance to Matt Parenteau for property located at 20 Copperfield Road, TM#152.-1-9.15 as follows:

- **Frontage variance of 75.55 feet**

With the following contingencies:

- **Property line that runs along 19 Copperfield Road maintains forever a 20 foot vegetative buffer, that no trees will be cut down**
- **The plan as presented to this Board showing where the manure storage is located will remain the same when that is developed**
- **Proposed barn, house and clear cutting that will occur to exercise the horses will remain in the back quadrant of the lot**

March 6, 2007

VOTE: Ayes: Conard, Granger, Lunde, Veitch, Weeks  
Noes: None

---

**CHARLES BAKER – Area Variance, Case #779**

Cohen Road

Charles Baker is present. T. Conard reviews that the applicant is requesting a 40' frontage variance to subdivide his property.

A public hearing is opened at 7:45 p.m. Lucrezia Panzarino, Cohen Road, asks for clarification. T. Conard explains that the applicant wants to subdivide his property into 2 roughly 4.2 acre lots with one having 185' of frontage and the other being a keyhole lot. The lots are within the legal zoning for that area. C. Baker explains what he is trying to do and that the house would be to the rear of the property and would not be visible from the road. L. Panzarino states that her only objection would be that they bought property here because of the 225' frontages, the rural setting and you do not see the houses. She states they bought here because they like the 225' and don't want it to look like Clifton Park. C. Baker states that there is a logging road which he will use as a shared driveway. L. Panzarino states that there is also the problem of wells and putting in additional wells. K. Veitch states that he is sure that DEC would not allow anything to be put in there if there was going to be an impact on any neighbor's water. T. Conard states that these will be 4.2 acre lots, not 1 acre lots. When it really makes a difference is if you have 1 acre or less size lots and everyone is putting in a well. M. Granger states that this area is zoned for 3 acre lots and what the applicant is asking for is in excess of the current zoning, and keyhole lots are permissible under the zoning laws of Greenfield. K. Veitch states that the applicant is not asking to reduce the amount of land that is required to build on, he is only asking for a smaller road frontage. K. Veitch asks how deep L. Panzarino's well is. Vincent Panzarino states that it is 245'. K. Veitch states that he does not believe they will have to worry about losing water in that area. L. Panzarino states that she just wants the area to stay the way it is. There being no further public comment, this public hearing is closed at 7:52 p.m.

P. Lunde states that it does not sound like the applicant is planning to build on the property anytime soon. C. Baker states that he has no intention of building there, he has two sons and would like to give each a lot. They enjoy the property the way it is right now. He just wants to take the opportunity now to subdivide this, his sons are young and he would like to be able to provide this for them, if it is possible. He would intend to use the logging road that is there now if they ever did decide to build. It might need to be widened a little bit to get trucks back in there, but other than that he would propose to leave all the woods along Cohen Road just the way they are and he is proposing to give the Steels a buffer all the way around, a no cut buffer of 75'. K. Veitch asks if he would agree to have that as part of the variance. C. Baker states that he would. He reiterates that he likes the wooded area the way that it is and the privacy, and he has no intention of changing that. He is proposing two 4.2 acre lots and right now there are three 3-acre lots; two that are a little over 4-acres and then five that are 5-acres, so it fits the character of the area and there should not be any visual impacts. He believes that he and the Steels would be the only ones to know that something was back there. C. Baker shows an aerial photo with his house and property, the neighboring properties, and the lot lines for his property. L. Panzarino asks if this property were sold in the future would other owners have to abide by the 75' buffer or would they be able to change that. C. Baker states that this can never be subdivided again. K. Veitch states that the requirements of the subdivision stay with the land. S. Weeks states that he likes the buffer in the front. V. Panzarino asks if he could subdivide his property. T. Conard states that both lots have to meet the acreage requirements.

**RESOLUTION – C. Baker, Area Variance**

MOTION: K. Veitch

SECOND: P. Lunde

March 6, 2007

RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals grants an area variance to Charles Baker for property located at 27 Cohen Road, TM#100.-2-1 as follows:

- **40' area variance for frontage**

This is based on the following contingencies:

- **The applicant agrees to a 75' buffer along the property line of the Steel's and a buffer along Cohen Road**

This approval is based on the following criteria:

- **No negative impact to the neighborhood**

C. Baker points out that the only area where the buffer will be a little less is the area along where the existing logging road currently comes closer to the Steel's property line. He points out that the property line comes in at an angle.

VOTE: Ayes: Conard, Granger, Lunde, Veitch, Weeks  
Noes: None

---

**MATT PARENTEAU – Area Variance, Case #778**

Copperfield Road

M. Granger states that she wants to amend the earlier motion for Matt Parenteau.

**RESOLUTION – M. Parenteau, Area Variance**

MOTION: M. Granger

SECOND: K. Veitch

The approval is based on the following:

- **No undesirable change to the neighborhood**
- **No adverse physical or environmental effects**

VOTE: Ayes: Conard, Granger, Lunde, Veitch, Weeks  
Noes: None

---

Meeting adjourned 8:00 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland  
Secretary