

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD

September 24, 2024

REGULAR MEETING

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by Tonya Yasenchak Chair at 7:00 p.m. On roll call the following members are present. Butch Duffney, Steve Licciardi, Beth Podhajecki, Joe Sabanos, Robert Roeckle, Tonya Yasenchak. C. Dake and Clyde Ronk are absent. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer is present. Justin Reckner, Zoning Administrator/Code Enforcement Officer is absent.

Minutes

August 27, 2024

MOTION: J. Sabanos

SECOND: B. Podhajecki

RESOLVED, The Planning Board waives the reading of and accepts the Minutes with minor corrections.

VOTE: Ayes: S. Licciardi, B. Podhajecki, J. Sabanos, R. Roeckle, T. Yasenchak,

Noes: None

Abstain: B. Duffney

Absent: C. Dake and C. Ronk

Minutes

August 27, 2024

To be reviewed at the next meeting.

Old Business & Public Hearing

Faminano, M. & A. Case #740
 TM# 151.-2-39

Minor Subdivision
 17 Canty Road

Jim Vianna is present for the applicant. T. Yasenchak states that the Board received his modifications. J. Vianna states that dropped the 3rd lot. They were not going to build on it anyway. He states that they did the site distance with the Town of Greenfield's intersection stopping site distance. He moved the driveway 120' and got the site distance at 55 miles per hour. He states that it is not a busy road it only has 6 houses on it. He would rather use the most stringent than doing an easement. He states that revised and submitted the first page of the application and the first page of SEQRA. He added the proposed house, septic system, and the well to the map. He researched the Bell Brook and it is classified as a Class C stream. He did add a T. 100' buffer from the brook. C. Baker likes that they dropped a lot. Bell Brook

does not have a regulation for setbacks, but states that it is a good idea. The Town follows ASSHTO Standards for site distance. T. Yasenchak opens the public hearing at 7:07 p.m. No one is present to speak about this project. T. Yasenchak closes the public hearing at 7:08 p.m. The Board reviews Part 1 of the Short Form SEQRA. The Board reviews Part 2 SEQRA.

MOTION: R. Roeckle

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board completes Part II of the Long Form SEQRA. All questions are answered "no" and the second box is checked, indicating that this will not result in no significant negative environmental impacts for the for a Recreational Field of Michael Faminano for property located at 17 Canty Road, TM# 151.-2-39

VOTE: Ayes: B. Duffney, S. Licciardi, B. Podhajecki, J. Sabanos, R. Roeckle, T. Yasenchak, and

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: C. Dake and C. Ronk

MOTION: R. Roeckle

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby grants approval for Michael Faminano for property located at 17 Canty Road, for a Minor Subdivision TM# 151.-2-39 noting that the Short Form SEQRA was reviewed and the public hearing was opened and there were no comments and there was Negative Declaration from the SEQRA.

VOTE: Ayes: B. Duffney, S. Licciardi, B. Podhajecki, J. Sabanos, R. Roeckle, and T. Yasenchak,

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: C. Dake and C. Ronk

DISCUSSION

J. Vianna states that he has done projects in Town and feels that the Town is too stringent with driveways and intersections. He does not feel that it is right. It makes a huge difference. He had to push the driveway over 120' to get the site distance that the Town required.

T. Yasenchak states that since the Board met last time she got a few answers from Town Council. She states that the Cartier project on Sand Hill Road is not valid. The Town has a Code 90-4 and it is applicable to projects that have been approved and left idle for 3 years or more it is null and void. She reads the Code. R. Roeckle states that needs to be very clear in the Code. She states that there was another project in question. Thalia Court and the it was approved in 2007. 2 lots were sold at the road and 1 in the back. The road bond was never put in place and nothing has been done since. Now they want to come back and do the road. She checked with Town Council and the same Code applies here 90-4. They will have to start all over from the beginning. C. Baker states the intersection site distance adds another element and added the distance to that. He states that he looked back and 2 years after he started as

the Town Engineer there was a meeting with the Town Council and the Town and Town Council and they had a traffic engineer make a recommendation that the Town has a right to go as elevated standards as they want to. Just like the Town requires 4' separation for the septic systems, NYS requires 2' separation. The Town has a right to be as stringent as they want. He does agree that it should be in the Code just like the septic requirements should be. It is certainly in the Town to change that. I suggest they work with a traffic engineer. He states that even if it goes in the Code the Board may still get push-back for it. B. Duffney states that it is a safety issue. C. Baker agrees.

Meeting adjourned at 7:29 p.m. All members in favor.

Respectfully submitted by,

Kimberley McMahon
Planning Board Executive Secretary

