

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD**  
**PLANNING BOARD**

**July 29, 2025**

**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, and Clyde Ronk, alternate. Justin Reckner, Zoning Administrator/Code Enforcement Officer is present. Charlie Dake is absent.

Minutes

July 8, 2025

MOTION: S. Licciardi  
SECOND: J. Sabanos

RESOLVED, The Planning Board waives the reading of and accepts the July 8, 2025, Minutes with minor corrections.

VOTE: Ayes: S. Licciardi, B. Podhajecki, J. Sabanos, R. Roeckle, T. Yasenchak, and C. Ronk  
Noes: None  
Abstain: B. Duffney  
Absent: C. Dake

**Old Business & Public Hearing**

Tupelo Community Forest Case # 25-002  
TM# 113.-1-35.1 & 113.-1-35.2

SPR/SUP  
250 & 280 Greene Road

Charles Gottlieb, Aaron Vera, and William Aldrich are present. C. Gottlieb states that they are back in front of the Board for re-approval for a site Plan approval for 3 miles of trails for biking, hiking, or cross-country skiing. NYS DEC did not approve the 14-space parking lot, so they have dropped 4 parking spaces down to 10 parking spaces. They provided a traffic study from Verity Engineering that was done on July 11-13 from 7am-10pm. At peak time for Tupelo there were 5 cars parked there. They are looking to add signage stating "No trailers" on the site. Then the Code Enforcement Officer can give tickets. They are also looking to add a sign stating, "No parking on the right-of-way". If they break any of these laws' violations can be issued. Once they get everything approved, they can come back in front of the Board after 6-12 months to see how everything is going. Public recreation trails fall in line with the Town's Comprehensive Plan with the preservation of open space. W. Aldrich states that he was born in Greenfield and this project is important to his family and to the public. A. Vera states that they submitted comments to C. Baker's letter, changes to the Site Plan, they received an Article 24 Permit from NYS DEC. He states that they walked the site with 4-9 DEC Officers two separate times, and they found nothing. B. Podhajecki asks if A. Vera can elaborate on the right-of-way. A. Vera states that people should not be parking on the shoulder of the road. B. Duffney asks how many parking spaces there are? A. Vera states that originally, they were approved for 14

sparking spots, however NYS DEC would not approve 14 spots they knocked them back to 10 parking spots. B. Duffney states that A. Vera states that parking in the right-of-way is a violation. C. Gottlieb states it could be a condition for approval and if someone does park in the right way they could get shut down. B. Duffney states the Code Enforcement Officer has a life on the weekends. If someone takes a picture of the happening, it could be used as evidence for a violation. C. Ronk states that this is a law enforcement issue. T. Yasenchak states that the Planning Board cannot rule on property in the right-of-way. They can't require signs, it may be the Town Board. She does not know the process. C. Gottlieb states that there is no parking allowed on the road. T. Yasenchak states that the Planning Board cannot rule on that, that is a on the owner. Town Board needs to rule on that. T. Yasenchak opens the public hearing at 7:21 p.m. She states that this project was previously approved for 14 parking spots. Now they are looking to reduce the parking spaces from 14 to 10. The Board does like to see people and children being in the woods. They are in front of the Board for a modification to the previous approval. Mark Powers, Greene Road, states that there has been dog training there and car alarms going off for long periods of time. Does he have to put cameras up in front of his house. He states that he did not come to Greenfield to look at that. If the park is open people will come from all over. This is completely not in compliance and can't be managed. There is plenty of things to go wrong. It will become an institution, and it will not stop. Judy Trainer, Greene Road, agrees with M. Powers and asks why the parking can't go in the back by the NYS trail system parking on Cohen Road. Chris Yarsavich, Greene Road, works with Saratoga Shredders, states that they would love to see this park open. He agrees with the amount of parking spaces at 10 and this no need for a trailer parking space. Margaret Trainor, Greene Road, states that no one wants to see a child smooched the road. She does not understand why the parking is not moved down the road. If they have an unsafe location for the parking lot why not avoid that and put in a different larger location. John Streit Locust Grove Road, states that he was on the Planning Board for 12 years and everyone seemed to be fair and respectful. The previous Code Enforcement Officer was very flawed. The owner lives 3000 miles away, and has a fondness for the property. He feels that the owner has not been treated fairly. Twin Leaf Farms, Hyspot Road, and the sawmill on Wilton Road do not have permits. It is unfair. He states that he has never seen constant parking there. He states no one has ever been hit there. To deny this project is unfair. Signs that say "No parking" is not enforceable. James North, Greene Road, states that this project is similar to Graphite Range. It is a very close resemblance it supports 10 parking spaces. He states that they can construct the parking area on his property. Yeliz Karabacak, Greene Road, states this is a safety issue, and it continues to happen. They have witnessed 13 incidents with documentation since May 31, 2024. There was an abandoned car, so they called the cops. She does not know of any criminal activity there. There is noise disturbance. The neighbors are inconvenienced. If the lot is full people will park on the road. Erika Walsh, Greene Road, states that it is illegal to park on the side of the road where the cars are parking on. There have been 3 signs that the Town has put up. Signage does not work. They have been burdened with this. They have evidence. This is a safety issue, and it is their biggest complaint. They have no confidence the property owner will maintain this. J Steet talks of fairness. The location is ridiculous. Vince Walsh, Greene Road, states that this property borders their property and it has impacted their lives in a negative way. T. Yasenchak states that she is conflicted. He reads the May 14, 2024, resolution. They came in because they had a violation. There are more and more problems that continue with this project. Larry Ramsey, Greene Road states that he had people and equipment that he could help with this project. He does not want to see anyone killed. It is dangerous. Someone will get hurt. Ethan Winters, states that he owns property in Town. He states that Graphite Range has 23 parking spaces plus 2 handicapped parking spaces. Any community forest should have stewards looking after the property. The Town of Wilton and the County approved that project. If this project is not approved, they can still have people on the property. No one else wants to

speak about this project T. Yasenchak adjourns the public hearing at 8:02 p.m. B. Podhajecki states she would like to see the parking lot moved. C. Gottlieb states that they have to be mindful of the wetlands and the hinderance to the wetlands. A. Vera states that they are looking for an amendment to what was previously approved. J. Sabanos asks if this meets the ASSHTO Standards for Intersection stopping distance. T. Yasenchak states Creighton Manning did a speed study, and it was within the ASSHTO Standards for Intersection stopping distance. The Board cannot control people speeding. J. Sabanos states that he feels that they went above and beyond. T. Yasenchak states that the Board can only go by people following the law. J. Sabanos states that he is a certified safety professional and he feels that the due diligence has been done. T. Yasenchak states that they received their approval from the Board they still had to get approval from DEC so they do not have a permit to revoke. J. Sabanos states continue moving forward and coming back in front of the Board after this project has been open for 6 months to a year. B. Duffney states that he agrees. He states that they are back in front of the Board and reducing the parking spaces from 14-10 spaces. Do they have to go back to DCE. A. Vera states no. B. Duffney states that he feels that if they come back in front of the Board a year to see how things are going. The Town has nothing to do with someone parking in the right-of-way. T. Yasenchak agrees and states vehicles break down act. She asks if the gate will be closed at night. E. Winters states that the Community Forest has a gate and it is closed at night. Their hours are dusk to dawn. A. Vera states hours of operation to be dawn to dusk and modify the existing gate. B. Duffney states the gate is a big thing for him. It is a safety issue. C. Ronk states that he does not have a problem with reducing the parking spaces from 14 to 10. S. Licciardi states that the study is adequate and he agrees with J. Sabanos and B. Duffney. He makes a motion to close the public hearing.

MOTION: S. Licciardi

SECOND: J. Sabanos

T. Yasenchak states that she does not feel comfortable with closing the public hearing. The Town does not have the authority, and she would like more clarity. R. Roeckle states that the Planning Board has no authority over the Sheriff's Department that is up to the Town Board. B. Duffney states that the Town Board could make that call. R. Roeckle states that the Planning Board can't do anything else besides requesting the applicant to put up sign on his property. The Board has no control over what people do on the road. T. Yasenchak states that it is impossible to regulate and feels that it is not fair to the applicant. The project was put in without approval and they have since received approval and now they are amending it. She does not feel comfortable closing the public hearing, because then the clock starts and the Board needs to make a determination within 62 days. R. Roeckle states that we have 4 meetings in 62 days. J. Sabanos states that he is not sure what else the Board is looking for. T. Yasenchak states that is a good point. S. Licciardi states that he feels comfortable with closing the public hearing and does not feel it is a sticking point. R. Roeckle states that possibly add a sign that states obeying the rules. C. Gottlieb states that he will talk to his client but does think this is possible. It is a community based project. T. Yasenchak states the signage is helpful. Make sure that there is room for a 3-point turn. She states that if this was County owned that would be different, but this is private property. She reads the Code for a recreation area. She states that she will have the resolution reviewed by Town Counsel. A. Vera states that they have some work to do such as getting the gate modified. R. Roeckle asks if the parking spaces can be made wider now that they don't have to do the landscaping. A. Vera affirms they do not need to do any landscaping. R. Roeckle states that it is less disturbance. A. Vera states yes, the land disturbance is reduced by 50%. R. Roeckle states that he does not need to see the signage. R. Roeckle states that he would like to review the resolution. T. Yasenchak states that this is an approved project. The Board can't control people if they are breaking the law. T. Yasenchak

re-opens the public hearing at 8:38 p.m. C. Yarsavich states that he agrees with the signage and educating people. Amy Knoeller, Greene Road, states that that it is disrespectful to people that are riding their bikes and feels that it is unfair. James North, Greene Road, Graphite Range gate is not closed at night. V. Walsh asks what happened to the litigation between your company and the company that is representing W. Aldrich. T. Yasenchak states this person has nothing to do with that. It was only \$1,500.00. This is about doing the right thing. She didn't work for him. The Board follows the Code and is a rule follower. The Planning Board is here to follow process. V. Walsh, Greene Road, they have more violations with DEC. He feels that they need to address them before the Board comes up with a decision. Diane Streit thanks the Aldrich family for this project. It is close to every business on 9N. T. Yasenchak states that it was in front of the Planning Board for 2 years, however there were several months in between submittals. T. Yasenchak closes the public hearing at 8:48 p.m. T. Yasenchak asks if the parking area is stone dust. A. Vera states that it can't be stone it has to be stone dust. T. Yasenchak states there is a motion and a second the Board will have Town Counsel review the resolution and they will be on the meeting. B. Duffney asks if there are any violations on the property. A. Vera states no, there are no violations on the property. He visited the site with 3 DEC Officers and none of them said anything. He states that they asked DEC for a letter, but they don't do it. DEC did re-flag the adjacent wetlands. T. Yasenchak reads the Code and question Q states that if there is a violation on the property the Board can't take action unless it is to fix the violation.

Sterling Environmental Engineering/Brookview MHP Case # 690  
TM# 151.-2-6

PUD  
3499 Rt. 9N

Jeff Yoruk is present. T. Yasenchak states that this project is a referral from the Town Board for a Planned Unit Development and the Board requested more information. She states that the Board is not re-opening the public hearing tonight. The Board will re-notice the public hearing. Jeff Yoruk, Engineer, states that it has been over a year since they have been in front of the Board. They have made a number of changes. They did away with the entrance onto Route 9N, they are moving the units away from the property line, and they moved the recreation area to the middle of the property. Other concerns were wells and water. The hydrologist has stated that they have 55 gallons of water per minute. NYS approved the new well. T. Yasenchak states that there is not a letter from the school. They did receive a letter from the Sheriff's Department. In 2023, the Town Engineer wrote an 11-point letter so the Board can go through SEQRA. The PUD language will need to be submitted again. J. Sabanos asks if the new well and water treatment will service just the 40 new units. J. Yoruk states no, for the whole park. J. Sabanos asks if they will be adding a privacy fence. J. Yoruk states they intend to block that area. B. Podhajecki states that she is pleased to see that they are being respectful and likes that they moved the road. B. Duffney is the well deep enough to service the entire park. J. Yoruk states that it is still under design. B. Duffney asks if they are using existing sewer system? J. Yoruk states yes, updated the water treatment system. B. Duffney agrees with J. Sabanos. C. Ronk asks if the wetlands have changed and does it affect this project? T. Yasenchak states not if they are within the 200' buffer. That needs to be shown on the map. April 11, 2023; letter from EDP is attached. She asks if they received anything from the Fire Department. She states that this is an Advisory Opinion to the Town Board. M. English states that he submitted a FOIL request and he won't receive that until after the public hearing. T. Yasenchak states that he can go into the office and review the project. The Board has nothing to do with FOIL requests. M. English rolled his eyes to T. Yasenchak states don't roll your eyes

at me please be respectful. The Board sets a public hearing for August 12, 2025. She states that they don't expect to receive everything on this list in time for the meeting.

---

### **New Business**

Miller, W. & K. Case # 25-001  
TM# 123.-3-11

SPR  
361 Plank Road

Tony DiDombo and Karen Miller are present. T. DiDombo states they are in front of the Board for a Special Use Permit. They are here for a change to their SUP. The first time they were in front of the Board for a SUP they were going to use it as an office and have since changed their minds to have a garage apartment. T. Yasenchak states this is in LDR District. This is only Site Plan Review in this District. She asks if there is an in-law apartment in the main house. T. DiDombo states no. T. Yasenchak asks if the garage apartment has it's own well and septic? She asks what is the size of the garage apartment? T. DiDombo states just under 1000 square feet. T. Yasenchak states the exact square footage will need to be provided. R. Roeckle states that a garage apartment must be 1000 square feet or less and no more than 40% of the home. T. Yasenchak states that the Town will need the document with the square footage. A public hearing is required. R. Roeckle states that he presumes that they did have a public hearing when they went for their KROD District Overlay review. T. DiDomino asks if they can get a conditional approval. B. Podhajecki states she is fine if they don't need public hearing. J. Sabanos states he is fine with not having a public hearing. B. Duffney states that they had a public hearing with the KROD District and if it is over 1000 square feet it will have to go in front of the ZBA. T. Yasenchak states the still need to know it is under the 1000 square feet. S. Licciardi asks for clarification if it was approved and rendered as a garage if it was a SUP then. The Code states that this is SPR in this District. B. Duffney asks how will this be verified. T. DiDombo states J. Reckner can review this tomorrow. T. Yasenchak states if it is approved. J. Reckner states that he will look into it.

Motion: R. Roeckle  
SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby grants approval for Site Plan Review, for William and Karen Miller located at 361 Plank Road, TM# 123.-3-11 contingent upon:

- The garage apartment is under 1000 square feet and the conditioned floor plan be verified and there was a previous public hearing.

VOTE: Ayes: B. Duffney, B. Podhajecki, J. Sabanos, R. Roeckle, C. Ronk, S. Licciardi and T. Yasenchak  
Noes: None  
Abstain: None  
Absent: C. Dake

---



Saratoga Polo Case # 25-006  
TM# 152.-1-106

PUD  
2 Bloomfield Road

Joseph Mallek is present. J. Mallek states that the Carver Company has owned the Saratoga Polo for a few years and are looking to sell. They are not looking to make any money from this just looking to unload it. They are possibly looking to dissolve the PUD. T. Yasenchak states that the Town Board approves PUD's not the Planning Board. The Code does allow for people to come in front of the Planning Board. The previous owner's PUD is very intense use. The Board look at this as a number of units and considered this transient. Keeping the aesthetic rural is important to the Town. There are limitations of the sewer, that is the main concern. There is sewer down Denton Road they could possibly tie into that, but they would have to go all the way down Denton Road. R. Roeckle states that water is an issue they could possible tie into the County sewer. T. Yasenchak states that is the only place to tie into. The County won't let anyone tie into that. It is a large hurdle. J. Mallek states that he is fine with hurdles. R. Roeckle states that there is city water at Stewart's Plant. The Town Board will want to see how to maintain the water system. J. Mallek asks how to market the property. T. Yasenchak states that this parcel is zoned for 2 acre minimum. They currently have a PUD. They would need to do SEQRA if they dissolve the PUD along with a bunch of other things. They would want to keep it visually rural. R. Roeckle reads the fractional residents with the PUD. Nothing says how many have public or private water. The County might take something off it. J. Mallek states that the PUD is ambitious. J. Sabanos states that he does not know why they don't market it as a PUD. T. Yasenchak states that he doesn't mean they have to do it. R. Roeckle states that they can revoke the PUD back to MDR-2 with 2 acre minimum with sewer. T. Yasenchak states this district does not allow for a SPR. R. Roeckle states that they can amended to PUD or remove it. J. Mallek asks what does the Board recommend. R. Roeckle states that is up to them. He states if they stay with the PUD they won't need to do any redistricting of the water. S. Licciardi states the approved PUD is only 10% of the total use of the parcel. Why give that up as long as they stay within it. R. Roeckle states that polo is good for the PUD. T. Yasenchak agrees and they could just develop it. S. Licciardi states that he feels that it is marketable as it is. It is a good use of the property. T. Yasenchak states that they could go with an Home Owners Association and that would be with the Attorney General. J. Sabanos states that MRD-2 is a minimum of 3 acres or stick with the PUD. This PUD is tasteful and in the spirit of the Comprehensive Plan. B. Podhajecki states that this is perfect for equine property, it has that history. J. Mallek states that he would entertain the history part of this part of the world. B. Podhajecki states they would get the racecourse people polo people. Also people don't make any money they do it for the love of the sport. There is an equine vet right around the corner. B. Duffney states that B. Podhajecki states that she has carriage horses and feels a lot of people would like that. J. Mallek states the biggest hurdle is the water. T. Yasenchak states that keep it rural less visual dense utilities are hard. She states the neighbors are going to be concerned with the water. It is the lowest part of the Town. T. Yasenchak states public utilities on the road, a public road, or an HOA.

Flynn Design Case #25-012  
TM# 138.-1-19.2

PUD  
58-62 S. Greenfield Road

Trevor Flynn is present for the applicant. T. Flynn states that Casey Cornell is looking to add a PUD for his 3 parcels. They have provided a chart and listed of all the possible items he would to do in the PUD. In the Town's Code he could not find definitions. C. Cornell does not like the term junkyard. He prefers recycling center and there is no definition for it. It is a processing facility. Mostly a salvage yard. He is looking to put the storage yard, cell towers,

(that are currently there) and solar slightly higher in height. R. Roeckle states that the apartments there are pre-existing non-conforming. T. Flynn they are there in case he wants to do them at a later date. R. Roeckle states that he does not have a problem with this. A PUD is stand-alone law. Just provide the PUD language and Zoning language. He states that on the application it states that you are the owner. T. Flynn states that is how J. Reckner told him to fill it out. T. Yasenchak states that the Board will need an Authorization of Agent from him. T. Flynn states that J. Reckner did not tell him that. R. Roeckle states that he does not have a problem with this as long as meets the language and it is allowed in a PUD. T. Yasenchak states that the table was good to provide. T. Yasenchak states that there is also a moratorium on Solar. T. Flynn states that he is keeping the existing use. B. Podhajecki states that she feels this is a great idea. J. Sabanos states that a PUD is used as a tool. B. Duffney states that he knew Duane Cornell and it was always neat and clean, and it continues to be. He feels this is a need in Town. T. Flynn asks what his next step is. T. Yasenchak states that the Board will need a formal application then it will need to go to the Town Board with all the language.

---

55 Wilton Road LLC Case#25-010  
TM# 138.-2-96.1 &100

SPR  
55 Wilton Road

John Cannie and Frank Palumbo are present. J. Cannie states that there are 2 lots in the PUD. This is a type 2 action. They are going to try to clean up the PUD. T. Yasenchak states they are in front of the Planning Board because they are over their setbacks. The PUD over the line. J. Cannie states no it does not. F. Palumbo states last year we did the lot line adjustment and got approval to remove a barn and were allowed to build a larger barn on the property. J. Cannie states who do they go to front of to clean up the PUD. R. Roeckle states they will need to go back in front of the Town Board. R. Roeckle states the PUD language now allows for a buffer. B. Duffney asks what happened to the old barn. F. Palumbo states it is on hold and will be working on it with the PUD. It can't go where it was because of the lot line adjustment. T. Yasenchak asks how big that parcel is. F. Palumbo states 3.533 acres. R. Roeckle asks if the barn is agriculture use. T. Yasenchak states that the Board can't make a lot less conforming. J. Cannie states that the lot line adjustment conforms to the setbacks. F. Palumbo states that this has already been approved. They are not creating a substandard use. T. Yasenchak states that she is just asking for it to be reviewed. J. Reckner states if zoning is complaint is how the Board has approved in the past. T. Yasenchak states she is only asking for an interpretation, so they don't have to get a variance. She states that the Board is making sure that they don't set precedent. J. Cannie states that it is the owner's choice. T. Yasenchak states that it is about process. J. Cannie states that it is pre-existing non-conforming. T. Yasenchak states provide it in writing. F. Palumbo asks if they need a SUP for a driveway. J. Reckner states it needs to meet fire compliance. F. Palumbo asks if a driveway needs SPR. J. Reckner states only with some sort of easement. F. Palumbo states that the driveway is for agriculture use. He asks J. Reckner if a driveway would be agricultural use. J. Reckner asks because you may transport the horses over the driveway. F. Palumbo states yes. J. Reckner states no. T. Yasenchak states that she just wants to make sure it is the right process. J. Cannie states that if the owner is willing to do it is their prerogative. T. Yasenchak states that any lot line adjustment is approved by the Planning Board. J. Cannie states that he does not feel this is necessary. F. Palumbo disagrees and states it can be done on 3.533 acres. B. Duffney states that he does not want to set a precedent. C. Ronk agrees. R. Roeckle states

that can't be done without a variance. F. Palumbo states once they changed to lot to make it larger it didn't allow them to use it as a single-family residence. They already gave it up.

MOTION: R. Roeckle

SECONFD: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby grants approval for a Lot Line Adjustment for 65 Wilton Road, LLC TM# 138.-96.1 and 138.-2-100.

- The lot created only for agricultural use if used for any other use will require a variance.
- This Lot Line Adjustment is done to remedy a violation of building over the property line.

VOTES:

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

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: C. Dake

T. Yasenchak asks about lighting on the barn. F. Palumbo states all lighting fixtures are mounted to the building and are motion-activated and biorhythmic for the horses. R. Roeckle asks where are the doors. F. Palumbo states at both ends of the barn.

MOTION: R. Roeckle

SECOND: S. Licciardi

RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby grants approval as amended as presented and noting that the Board waived the public hearing on the property.

VOTES:

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

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: C. Dake

656 Locust Grove Road, LLC Case #25-008  
TM# 125.-2-74.77 & 78

Minor Subdivision  
656 Locust Grove Road

T. Yasenchak recuses herself. Mike Scuola is present. M. Scuola states that on the west side of his property nothing is changing. R. Roeckle states that last subdivision of this property was in 2024. M. Scuola states that there are multiple properties in these subdivisions and he is coming to the Planning Board to correct things that happened in the past. Mr. and Mrs. Dahl are present. M. Scuola states that he is looking to combined 5 acres the Dahl



property. Then Mr. Dahl can combine it to his current parcel. R. Roeckle states according to our Section 90-D this would be a major subdivision. R. Roeckle states B. Podhajecki states that she is really happy this is happening. B. Duffney and S. Licciardi agree. P. Loyola states that they will provide a SWPPP and a NOI to the Building Department and the erosion and sediment control, apply for a building permit for the septic, and there is no negative impact to the neighborhood. The Board sets a public hearing for August 12, 2025.

Meeting adjourned at 11:54 p.m. All members are in favor.

---

Respectfully submitted by,

Kimberley McMahon  
Planning Board Executive Secretary