

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD

August 12, 2025

REGULAR MEETING

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

Minutes

July 8, 2025

MOTION: C. Dake

SECOND: B. Podhajecki

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

VOTE: Ayes: C. Dake, S. Licciardi, B. Podhajecki, T. Yasenchak, and C. Ronk

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: B. Duffney, J. Sabanos, and T. Yasenchak

July 29, 2025

To be reviewed at the next meeting.

Old Business & Public Hearing

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

Minor Subdivision
656 Locust Grove Road

Mike Scuola is present. R. Roeckle states this is a public hearing this evening. M. Scuola states that this is a 2-lot subdivision at 643 Locust Grove Road. They are looking to right a wrong that happened several years ago and give 5 acres back to Chris Dahl. This is a corrective measure. R. Roeckle opens the public hearing at 7:03 p.m. Kristen Delaney, Locust Grove Road, provides paperwork from the County Clerk's Office. R. Roeckle asks if K. Delaney has a problem with this project. K. Delaney states that she is not happy with it but will deal with it. Greg Cooper, Locust Grove Road asks if this project needs a variance. R. Roeckle states no it is a keyhole lot. That lot was already approved. Joyce Logan, her mother's property, is right next door to this project and feels that this is too close to her mother's property and there has always been a problem with the culvert on the road. M. Scuola states that parcel was already approved. V. Walsh, Greene Road, states that there are a lot of people here that seem to be concerned, and they want to know what is being said. R. Roeckle states they are not speaking

up. V. Walsh states that are why they are there. Things are not being addressed. He asks the Board to please keep their eyes and ears open. C. Dake asks the Board if there is anything they need before the public hearing is closed. R. Roeckle states that he does not think so. B. Podhajecki states that she is glad this is being resolved and hopes that it works out like it is for the Dahl's. R. Roeckle closes the public hearing at 7:10 p.m. R. Roeckle states that 5 acres are going back to Dahl's. He states that the 2-lot subdivision on the west side was done in 2023. The Town Engineer stated in his letter that M. Scuola will need to amend the letter of intent.

MOTION: S. Licciardi
SECOND: C. Dake

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby grants approval for a Site Plan Review for 55-65 Wilton Road LLC, located at 55 Wilton Road, TM# 125.-2-74.77 and 125.-2-78 contingent upon:

- The Town Engineer's request for an amendment to be made to the letter of intent.

VOTE: Ayes: C. Dake, S. Licciardi, B. Podhajecki, T. Yasenchak, and C. Ronk

- Noes: None
- Abstain: None
- Absent: B. Duffney, J. Sabanos, and T. Yasenchak

Sterling/Brookview Case # 690
TM# 151-2-6

PUD
3499 Rt. 9N

Andrew Millspaugh is present and is from Sterling Environmental Engineering. He states that previous concerns were water supply, they removed the second entrance. They are proposing 40 new units with 2 access roads and a recreation area. The recreation was originally going at the front of the park and now they moved it to the middle of the park. They are looking to close the public hearing and have the Board review SEQRA then go back in front of the Town Board for PUD approval then back in front of the Planning Board for final approval. C. Dake asks if they are looking to use the existing PUD or are they looking to do a new PUD.A. Millspaugh states revised the existing PUD. R. Roeckle asks if the well that was drilled is it in use and has it been approved by NYS DOH. A. Millspaugh states that it needs to be approved by the Town. It is not in use. R. Roeckle asks how far down is the well. A. Millspaugh states 300'. R. Roeckle asks if there are any impact to change the stormwater. A. Millspaugh states with the new regulations it could be impacted. The west of the wetlands could be impacted. Currently there is a 100' buffer they may need to lose 1 or 2 units. They removed the driveway/road, so the stormwater won't be affected. R. Roeckle opens the public hearing at 7:21 p.m. Chris Hellerich, Pine Robin Road, states that their original deed states that there was never any construction on that lot. When UMH purchased the property that was omitted from the deed. It was done on purpose. He states that he reached out to DEC and UMH is asking for a change in their PUD, and they are asking for exceptions. He asks how long the Board is going to draw this out. The Board has enough not to approve this project. Phill Engborg, Pine Robine Road, asks what the duration of the water flow is. Michael Skura, Pine Robin Road, states that last time UMH was in front of the Board they said that they use 33 gallons a day/. 8,000 gallons a day went into a stream impacting the surface water. He states that he is used

to turning on his faucet and having clear water. The City of Saratoga has issued a water limitation there. Nicholas Frirsz, Pine Robin Road, states that his family lives at the perimeter of this parcel. He states that currently UMH has 171 units, and they are looking to add 40 more units. It is encroaching on the wetlands. The Town of Greenfield is 43,000 square acres. The Mobile home park has 171 units and are looking to expand and add 40 more units. That is 15% of the Town of Greenfield. This is over developed property. This is not acceptable within the law and Town. They are looking for a quick and rapid resolution. He states that he wants to make improvements to his property, however if this goes through, he will be moving out of Greenfield. Daniel Lynch, Pine Robin Road, states that the original deed states that they will not build on that parcel. He feels that UMH is cheating the residents. It was always their intention to sneak it in. He does not want to hear guns, police or fire vehicle sirens that are close to his house. Justin Thomas, Rt. 9N, states that he bought his home in 2001. He feels that it was left out of the deed on purpose. He feels that this well will be affected the most. He is well in 180' from the new well. The water level dropped 4' during the well testing. This might pass on paper, but we have droughts. Once the water is gone residents will move out of Greenfield. Chelsea Hellrich, Pine Robin Road, states that she runs her business out of her home. It is essential for her work for her classroom and recording studio. Her father also works in the arts. They are deeply inspired by nature. As Planning Board members, they guide the growth of the community to preserve this Town. This is exploding and the residents are the ones that pay the price. If this is approved that the Planning Board is choosing UMH over their community. Ann Womack, Pine Robin Road, states that the people that live in the park work in health care and work around the clock. It is not reasonable rent. Please listen to the residents. Mike Hurley, Locust Grove Road, states that he is a retired engineer. He states that the culvert has expanded and is overgrown. The storm water can't handle it without a substantial culvert. Katie Porter, Rt. 9N, states that she disagrees with this and feels this is out of greed. Their pump station is very close to their home. They were told that their acquirer will not be affected, it was affected. The testing was done in March when there was all the run-offs. There is no run-off now. The wetlands have dried up. There has been a lot of stress on her family over the last 10 years. It is time for closure. They want this to stop. Mark English, Pine Robin Road, states that the Planning Board needs to look at the hydrology report and the water use and read what DOH has started. Sterling Engineer's Tyler Sweet has emails stating that they use 136,000 gallons of water a day. DEC's regulations state that if they use over 100,000 gallons a day and they will need a permit from DEC. DEC does provide instructions that need to be followed. A well log was provided from March to May The well could have been drawing off the run-off. The streams behind him are diminishing. How much water is left in the Town. He has read the PUD regulations, and he feels this does not meet the Town's regulations. William May, Pine Robin Road, states when he purchased his home inspection done and found that he needed a new septic and had to spend \$4,500.00 on the new septic. The rural community is what brought him to Greenfield. This is not what he worked for. V. Walsh, Greene Road, urges the Planning Board to slow this down. The applicant is represented by attorneys, engineers, etc... They have unlimited resources. Did they submit items that were asked of them. The Town Board won't do the hard work like the Planning Board. The deed changed. Were the wetlands delineated. The residents are stressed out. It does not fit. It is the Planning Boards job to balance this out. Mary Palmateer, Locust Grove Road, states that this has no benefit to the community. It also impacts the residents on Locust Grove Road. People have put a lot of energy in the Town. They don't want Greenfield to look like Wilton. She echoes everyone that has spoken. R. Roeckle states that no one else is present to speak on behalf of this project. The Board adjourns the public hearing at 8:13 p.m. R. Roeckle reads the letter from the Town Engineer dated July 23, 2025, and he states that he does not feel he has enough information for this project to move forward. C. Dake states that the deed is interesting and would like the applicant to explain. A. Millsbaugh states that he would have to contact his attorney. C. Dake states that

this can change until it is approved by the Town Board, but then it will come back to the Planning Board. R. Roeckle states that he does not think it can be changed. C. Dake states that they can put in a quarter of units. C. Ronk asks if the wetlands delineated and looked at. A. Millspaugh states there is a 100' buffer. They may look at moving somewhere on the property. B. Podhajecki states that she is concerned about the deed. R. Roeckle states local governments don't enforce deeds restrictions. B. Podhajecki asks if the Planning Board can make it a consideration. R. Roeckle states that the Planning Board can let the Town Board know how they feel. The Town won't be able to enforce deed restrictions. The removal of language from the deed has nothing to do with the Town. B. Podhajecki states that the well testing was done in March. A. Millspaugh states the well was installed in January and tested in March. He states that they can include the conditions at the time of testing. The well is 300' down. They went 15' down farther than the other well. He states there was a whole other report that was done for DEC and DOH and that needs to be concurrent. Implications are annual reporting to DEC and DOH and those agencies do something if something is wrong, not this Board. R. Roeckle asks about the waste disposal and how it is that being taken care of. A. Millspaugh states that they are upgrading and that it needs to be approved by DEC. R. Roeckle asks if the system has been constructed. A. Millspaugh they can include that in their next submission as well they will add the fluent limits reported. They did not receive a letter from the Town Engineer.

Old Business

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

SPR/SUP
250 & 280 Greene Road

Aaron Vera and Robert Stowe are present. B. Podhajecki asks if the public hearing was closed. R. Roeckle states yes. B. Podhajecki asks where the sign will be posted. A. Vera states that it will be posted in the parking area for everyone to see. A. Vera states 12"x18 or they can do 18"x24". B. Podhajecki states as big as what is allowed. C. Dake recuses himself. A. Vera states that they went from 14 parking spaces to 10 parking spaces. B. Podhajecki states that the Board received a letter from Code Enforcement and the Board has nothing to do with that. J. Reckner states that parking will not be enforced by his office. R. Roeckle states for compliance. J. Reckner states correctly, his office will not be enforcing any parking regulations. R. Roeckle states that what if there is a violation of the site plan. The Town is not going to violate someone for someone else taking up 3 parking spaces. S. Licciardi states that this needs to be in operation and needs to come back in front of the Board in August 2026 for a review. A. Vera states correct; they are removing all the storm water all together. They do have the SWPPP still open. R. Roeckle states that they should remove the storm water management from the resolution or make a note that storm water is not needed. R. Stowe states this is limited approval, and this project has to come back in front of the Board at a later date of the SUP which will be revoked. R. Roeckle states that it can be renewed. S. Licciardi states that it needs to come back in front of the Board anyway. J. Reckner states that in regard to this project his department will not be enforcing parking. R. Roeckle states that Code Enforcement won't be enforcing the parking and that department does not do it anywhere else in Town. R. Stowe states that if they are not compliant that will be taken into consideration when this project comes back to the Board. j. Reckner states that he will take reports from the Planning Board not the residents. S. Licciardi states the Board could put conditions on the approval that simply goes into the record, and the Board can take that into account in August 2026.

MOTION: S. Licciardi

SECOND: C. Ronk

TOWN OF GREENFIELD PLANNING BOARD

RESOLUTION APPROVING AMENDED SITE PLAN AND SPECIAL USE PERMIT

WHEREAS, William Aldrich, Trustee of the William C. and Jennifer E. Aldrich Trust, by its counsel Charles J. Gottlieb of Whiteman, Osterman and Hanna has made application to the Greenfield Planning Board for amendment to their approved site plan approval and special use permit for a recreational facility known as Tupelo Community Forest, situated at 250 and 280 Greene Road, Tax Parcel 113.-1-35.1 and 35.2 in the Town of Greenfield; and

WHEREAS, a Public Hearing was held for the amendment to the approved site plan and special permit beginning on July 29, 2025; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has carefully considered the application and applicable criteria set forth in the Town Zoning Law and State Law.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED, that the Town of Greenfield Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. After reviewing the proposed amendment, including the reduction of the size of the parking area to 10 parking spaces and the removal of storm water management, the Planning Board finds that any environmental impacts of the original approval will be lessened by this amendment. Therefore, the Planning Board does not see the need to reopen SEQRA.
2. After reviewing the proposed amendment, including the reduction of the size of the parking area and storm water management, the Planning Board finds that the findings set forth in the original approval regarding the Greenfield Town Code Section 105-54 A. through Q, the Board finds no substantive changes. The original findings are listed as follows:
 - A. Operations in connection with the proposed use of a recreational facility for non-motorized bikes will not be more objectionable to nearby properties, which include an outdoor education center and State recreational lands, by reason of noise, fumes, vibration, illumination or other potential nuisance than other permitted uses in the district:

- a. Use is by single users only; no group events are proposed for this facility, including but not limited to races, bike rallies, fund raisers, schools, workshops, camps or training;
 - b. Noise will be limited due to nature of non-motorized bike use and specific hours of operation (7 am to official sunset)
 - c. Illumination is limited and mitigate by landscaping between parking lot and road. Facility will be closed in the evening when headlamps or bike lights would be required.
 - d. Potential nuisances from trespassing and security shall be limited by management plan which includes call numbers for stewards and allowance of Saratoga County Sherriff to access property. It is noted that NYS land has tree markings which denote state property lines.
 - e. A maintenance plan has been filed to ensure proper upkeep of the property & trails in conformance with the approved plans.
- B. Community infrastructure and services, including but not limited to protective services, roadways, garbage collection, schools and water and sewer facilities are currently adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
- a. The project will not increase the need for school services.
 - b. The Saratoga County Sheriff has provided a letter of service for the site.
 - c. There will be no on-site trash receptacles, water or sewer facilities (including no porta-potties or the like).
 - d. The bike trail has been modified / widened in the areas requested by the Town of Greenfield Fire Chief.
- C. The proposed site includes adequate soil capacity and natural features to safely support the proposed facilities and structures at the site.
- a. NYSDEC has reviewed the project for compliance with NYSDEC erosion control, wetland preservation and water crossings methods.
 - b. Stormwater management has been included as accessory to the

parking lot as reviewed & required by NYSDEC. (*Removed for this Resolution since the amended plan does not include stormwater management.*)

- c. The Management Plan provided notes that the facility will be closed when necessary due to seasonal conditions.
- D. The proposed site layout meets the provisions of the Zoning Law and other Town and State standards and complies with the Town's Comprehensive Plan. The project received an interpretation from the Town of Greenfield Zoning Board relating to definition of structure as related to the bike trails & setbacks. However, the Planning Board has required that brush barriers be placed in areas where the trails are in close proximity to property lines.
- E. The Board has considered a traffic study and addressed traffic flow, turning requirements, sight distances, parking and pedestrian traffic flow and avoiding pedestrian-vehicle conflicts. Vehicular and pedestrian traffic patterns associated with the proposed use will be appropriate and satisfactorily established and managed for the area involved. No parking signs have been added along Green Rd. to limit parking overflow onto the road.
- F. The proposed use, design and layout will be in harmony with the appropriate and orderly development of the surrounding areas.
- G. The proposed height and location of screening, parking and landscaping will not interfere with or discourage appropriate development of land adjacent to the site or unreasonably affect its value.
- H. Scale & Design of Neighborhood: No structures are proposed in connection with the proposed use.
- I. No exterior lighting is proposed, proposed signs have been reduced in size and relocated and adequate screening and landscaping have been incorporated into the proposed use.
- J. In reference to environmental concerns over potentially sensitive areas, the applicant has received or will receive a State DEC permit for the development and a non-jurisdictional determination from the Army Corps of Engineers. The development of the site will be organized to reflect the natural capabilities of the site to support the proposed use. There are no floodplains within this

property.

- K. The existing landscape will be preserved in its natural state to the extent practical as only a portion of the site will be constructed with trails and parking. Landscaping has been designed that will adequately buffer adjacent properties and separate parking areas.
- L. The site will provide for recreation areas and open space as it is a recreational use. However, it shall be noted that Section 105-122 is for “cluster subdivisions” and not applicable for this project.
- M. The proposed use has been or is being considered by other governmental agencies with jurisdiction. Letters and permits have been received by NYSDEC and ACOE.
- N. The Planning Board is aware of and has considered the authority granted in Town Code Section 105-54 N to adopt site plan review guidelines. The applicant has provided additional information as requested and discussed by the Planning Board during their review.
- O. The proposed use will comply with Chapter 49, Environmental Review, of the Greenfield Town Code. It shall be noted that the Town of Greenfield currently does not have an Environmental Commission.
- P. The proposed development will comply with applicable stormwater management requirements:
 - a. The applicant has submitted a SWPPP which has been reviewed by the Town Engineer.
 - b. The project is not a subdivision.
 - c. A NYSDEC SPDES permit is part of this application.
- Q. The application before the Planning Board is intended to remedy the prior violation of development of the site without site plan review or a special use permit.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board makes the following Decisions:

1. The amended site plan application is approved as presented with the updated

materials presented, received & approved; and

2. An amended special use permit is granted through August 31, 2026, such permit to be renewable for successive periods or permanently as authorized by further order of this Planning Board, on condition that the applicant comply with:
 - A. Stream mitigation measures as required by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation continue as approved and shall be maintained.
 - B. All maintenance work at the site is performed during regular business hours from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday.
 - C. Additional signage, in conjunction with the letter dated August 11, 2025, and sign design provided, indicating no parking is allowed along Greene Road for the users of the facility. See attached sign design.
 - D. The facility shall not be expanded in any way.

Duly adopted this 12th day of August 2025, by the following vote:

VOTE: Ayes: C. Dake, S. Licciardi, B. Podhajecki, T. Yasenachak, and C. Ronk

- Noes: None
- Abstain: None
- Absent: B. Duffney, J. Sabanos, and T. Yasenachak

New Business

Nightingale, N. Case #25-015

SUP

TM# 163.-2-82.1

200 Middle Grove Road

Greg Kaweckius present. C. Dake re-joins the Board. G. Kaweckius states that the prior owners used the property for horses. The current owners have family that come to visit and want to entertain and have an in-ground pool. They want it separate from the main house and leave it looking like a barn. It has a septic and a laundry room. There will not be any structural changes. They will be adding a bay. They are also looking to add solar, which is time sensitive (incentives are running out). B. Podhajecki asks if this is less than 1000 square feet. G. Kaweckius states no. G. Kaweckius states that they are only using half of the barn. R. Roeckle states that for a garage apartment you need to have a kitchen, bathroom, and a bedroom. B. Podhajecki asks how big the garage apartment is. R. Roeckle states it is 2765 square feet. G. Kaweckius states that they will be using the barn mostly as a pool house. B. Podhajecki states that pool house is the allowed square foot for living space. C. Dake states if the laundry room, bathroom, and foyer are not living space it can't be considered a dwelling unit. R. Roeckle

states that the ZBA could allow it. S. Licciardi agrees. R. Roeckle states that it is great use of the building, but it needs a variance. G. Kawecki states that they are replacing the metal roof off with shingles and adding solar. R. Roeckle states make the building permit for the upstairs only. He does not see a problem with that. J. Reckner states to have a garage apartment you need a bedroom, bathroom, and a kitchen. J. Reckner states that their setbacks are still applicable.

Harris, K. Case #25-016
TM# 111.-2-18.15

SPR
103 Allen Road

Keith Harris is present. C. Dake states that he has unrelated business with K. Harris, however he does not feel it will affect this project. K. Harris states that he turned his garage into an apartment for his kids that were coming home from college. He tried to rent it out and that did not pan out. Now he is just looking to use it for family. B. Podhajecki asks if he is changing the propane line. K. Harris states no. B. Podhajecki asks what is the square footage of the apartment. K. Harris states 600 square feet. J. Reckner states it is 963 under 1000 square feet. K. Harris states that he did a subdivision in 2010. R. Roeckle states that the side yard setback is 50' in some places, but not all. K. Jarris states that he had a survey done in 2010. R. Roeckle reads J. Reckner's letter to the Board. He states that he spoke with Town Counsel, and they stated that just because it wasn't caught in 2010 does not mean that it does not need to be corrected. R. Roeckle asks if there is a separate septic. K. Harris states yes. R. Roeckle asks if they use the same well. K. Harris states yes. R. Roeckle states that in LDR District this is a Site Plan Review, and it does not need a public hearing, however he will need a variance. He states that the Board can't move forward until K. Harris receives an area variance.

Meeting adjourned at 9:46 p.m. All members are in favor.

Respectfully submitted by,

Kimberley McMahan
Planning Board Executive Secretary