

File
Copy

To: Guilderland Planning Board

From: Guilderland Conservation Advisory Council

Re: Tymchyn, 5800 Ostrander Road, Altamont, NY 12009

APPLICATION

Applicant: Virginia Tymchyn, 5800 Ostrander Road, Altamont, NY 12009

Proposed Subdivision: A proposed two lot subdivision of 51.9 acres.

Location: The property is located in the western part of the town, on the eastern side of Ostrander Road, and west of Grant Hill Road.

Zoning: RA3

Site Inspection Summary:

Site Inspection Date: December 19, 2015

Meeting Attendees (December 14, 2015): Rich Reilly, Presenter; GCAC Members Kevin Connolly, Gordon McClelland, Gustavo Santos, Steve Wacksman, and Stuart Reese (acting chair).

Inspected by: Rich Reilly, presenter; GCAC Members Kevin Connolly, Gordon McClelland, Stuart Reese (acting chair), Gustavo Santos, and Steve Wacksman.

Conclusions: GCAC has no objection to this subdivision. No new development on either lot is proposed at this time. It appeared to the GCAC that there was adequate space for a building site, and ample road frontage with no line-of-sight problems for a possible driveway, on the new lot (Lot 2) being created. If any future development were proposed, it would be contingent on Albany County Health Department advice and approval for well and septic placement. Presenter stated at the time of inspection that no percolation tests had been done, and that well water in the area was problematic.

Submitted By: Stuart W. Reese

Stuart W. Reese - Acting Chair

INSPECTION DETAILS:

Applicant: Virginia J. Tymchyn

Address: 5800 Ostrander Road, Altamont, NY 12009

Background: The presenter, Rich Reilly, of the firm Gleason, Dunn, Walsh & O'Shea, stated that Virginia and Victoria Tymchyn have owned the property for about 90 years. Victoria is deceased, and Virginia is going to move. She wishes to divide the property into two lots: Lot 1, about 2.05 acres, includes the current house, garage, and in-ground pool; and Lot 2, about 50 acres, includes the barn, two ponds, a hayfield and wooded land. The prospective buyer for Lot 1 is not interested in the barn, and a neighbor wishes to buy Lot 2 for farming and recreation.

Topography: Lot 1 and the hayfield part of Lot 2 are mostly flat, with a gentle slope down from north to south. The wooded land on Lot 2 slopes up to the north and east, and in some places the slope appears fairly steep.

Vegetation/Trees: Lot 1 has a few trees along the proposed boundary with Lot 2. Most of the western half of Lot 2 is cleared, with hay stubble covering it; the tree line north and east of the hay field has a thin line of deciduous trees, perhaps pioneer trees, and the greater part of the wooded land appears to be pine.

Soil: According to the presenter, the soil is mostly clay. On the Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey, about half the property, including most of Lot 1, the hayfield on Lot 2, and a good portion of the woods, is Nunda Silt Loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes (NuB). The Soil Survey of Albany County, New York, describes this as a gently sloping soil, very deep and moderately well drained. It is suitable for most crops and for pasture, but erosion can be a hazard. The main limitation of this soil for dwellings with basements is the seasonal high water table, which may require drains to lower the table. The limitations for septic tanks are the seasonal high water table and slow percolation in the subsoil and substratum. These limitations, of course, would only have to be taken into account if there were any development in the future. The rest of the land on this property also consists of silt loam soils, with differing names depending on the slope. These soils have characteristics similar to NuB.

Drainage/Wetlands: The property has no demarcated wetlands, but Lot 2 has two ponds on the south-west portion. Drainage appears to be from north-east to the south-west, towards these ponds. There is a culvert underneath the pathway between the ponds, connecting them.

Septic/Wells: The dwelling on Lot 1 is served by a well and septic tank. Neither are proposed for Lot 2, since no building is planned.

Visual Impact: None, since no new buildings are proposed.

Endangered Species: None mentioned by the presenter, and none noted by the committee at the time of the site visit.

Historical Considerations: Mr. Reilly stated in his presentation that he thought the barn was 60 years old, and the house perhaps 50 years old. The property does not contain a graveyard, and no Indian artifacts have been found. Nothing of historical interest was noted at the site visit.

Submitted by: Stuart W. Reese

Stuart W. Reese, acting chair