

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD

May 27, 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. Charlie Dake, Butch Duffney, Steve Licciardi, Beth Podhajecki, Joe Sabanos, Robert Roeckle, Tonya Yasenchak, and Clyde Ronk, alternate. Justin Reckner, Zoning Administrator/Code Enforcement Officer is absent.

Minutes

May 13, 2025

MOTION: C. Dake

SECOND: S. Licciardi

RESOLVED, The Planning Board waives the reading of and accepts the May 13, 2025 Minutes with minor corrections.

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

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Conant, E. Case #750
TM# 139.-1-35.1 & 139.-1-35.2

Minor Subdivision
163 & 189 Wilton Road

Alisa Dalton is present for the applicant. T. Yasenchak states that this project was in front of the Zoning Board of Appeals and received variances now they are back in front of the Planning Board. A. Dalton states that she is the attorney for both properties. She states that the Studio parcel received 2 side yard setbacks Area Variances, one was 7'.3" and the second was 3'.6". Lot 1 received 1 Area Variance for the northern side yard setback of 2'.9". Lot 3 received an Area Variance for 35'.4" for the northern side yard setback. T. Yasenchak states that this property will not be able to be re-subdivided for future subdivisions without receiving other variances because frontage will not be met. It might be difficult to obtain because there is no hardship. She states that the Board did have a letter from the Town Engineer and he asked the Board to clarify that they will need to have easement language on the map before the maps are signed. T. Yasenchak states that they will need to see the sight distance ASSHTO standards for intersection stopping. R. Roeckle states that they will still need an easement for Lot 1 to access Wilton Road. It's all family now, but it won't be forever. He states they need something on the map showing that the Studio is a single-family-residence, because a Studio would not be allowed in the zoning. A. Dalton asks if the easement is better in the deed or language a separate easement document. T. Yasenchak and R. Roeckle states it would be better to put the language in the deeds. A. Dalton asks if the sight distance should be on the map. T. Yasenchak states yes, please. They are not asking for sight distance for the existing

driveway because it has been in existence for 100 years. B. Duffney states that they got their variances it looks good to him. T. Yasenchak states if someone chooses to take the Studio down the variances are only for the existing building. R. Roeckle states that variances go with the property. T. Yasenchak states correct, but if they take the Studio down. R. Roeckle states that it depends on how the variances were worded. Were they granted for the existing building or just for the setbacks. It depends on the wording. T. Yasenchak states that there is a lot of land back there and what if someone decides that they don't want to put the house there and that building is not in the greatest shape. The Board always talks about limits of clearing with a subdivision. She asks the Board if that is something they want to include on this project. B. Duffney states he does not feel it is necessary. T. Yasenchak asks she is not talking about logging she is talking about clearing like the property on Middle Grove Road. T. Yasenchak asks does the Board just want to assume that the property won't be cleared. B. Duffney states if they sell the lot does the limit of clearing cover that. R. Roeckle states technically yes. He feels that noting if any existing structures removed must come back in front of the Board. B. Duffney states that because there is a developer that just goes in and clear the whole lots when he is not supposed to. He feels that if someone buys property they can do what they want on their property. So, it is not their property. It's your property that you pay taxes on and someone else is telling you what they can do. He understands limits of clearing for the home. T. Yasenchak states when the Board reviews a subdivision they Board reviews SEQRA and for new homes the Town Engineer will require is a total SWPPP. In the resolution she feels the Board can note that SEQRA was done with the existing homes on the map. They are not reviewing any future construction which may have a reaction to the SWPPP. A. Dalton states that the likelihood is that someone would want to rebuild, because the structure is not in good condition. T. Yasenchak states that if the soil disturbance is more than an acre a SWPPP will need to be done. R. Roeckle states if disturbance is more than 1 acre a SWPPP will be required for each parcel. T. Yasenchak states yes. The easement can come in when the maps get signed, but they will need the sight distance on the map. The Board sets a public hearing for this project for June 10, 2025. R. Roeckle states that they need a note on the plans that the easement will be attached to the deed.

Meeting adjourned at 7:36 p.m. All members in favor.

Respectfully submitted by,

Kimberley McMahon
Planning Board Executive Secretary