

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD**

**PLANNING BOARD**

**MINUTES**

**April 28, 2026**

**Regular Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by T. Yasenchak, Chair, at 7:01 p.m. On roll call the following members are present: S. Licciardi, C. Dake, B. Podhajecki, R. Roeckle, B. Duffney, J. Sabanos, and C. Ronk (Alternate). Building Inspector J. Reckner is present as well as E. Faas. Town Attorney Brian Reichenbach is present.

**Minutes**

February 24, 2026

MOTION: C. Dake

SECOND: S. Licciardi

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of February 24, 2026, minutes and accepts the corrected minutes.

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

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

---

March 10, 2026

MOTION: C. Dake

SECOND: R. Roeckle

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of March 10, 2026, minutes and accepts the corrected minutes.

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: B. Duffney

---

March 31, 2026

MOTION: R. Roeckle

SECOND: B. Podhajecki

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of March 10, 2026, minutes and accepts the corrected minutes

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

Noes: None

Abstain: None

### **New Business**

Clemmy, Timothy - #PB 26-012

Lot Line Adjustment

TM# 125.-3-13

13 Walker Drive

The Applicant is present. J. Grassi is present as well, representing the Applicant. T. Clemmy is in front of the Board for a sketch plan review of a lot line adjustment. J. Grassi explains the Applicant is seeking a lot line adjustment to allow for a keyhole lot, essentially to access Ericson Drive. The request is intended to address a long-standing subdivision complication where Walker Drive was originally envisioned to extend and provide access, however the road was never completed. The proposed lot line adjustment would create a keyhole-style access strip to Ericson Drive, similar to an arrangement on the opposite side of Walker Drive where a parcel has access by easement. The Applicant stated they purchased and held the adjoining lot for many years, originally expecting the road to be built. Due to current housing costs, the Applicant wishes to make the parcel buildable so that a family member may construct a home there.

The Board members generally supported the keyhole lot concept, given the unusual circumstances of an unfinished subdivision and effectively landlocked area, however T. Yasenchak noted that the Town's typical keyhole lot access width standard is 40 feet.

J. Grassi indicated flexibility to pursue either increasing the access strip to 40 feet by agreement with the adjoining owner, W. Samascott, or by seeking an area variance if a narrower strip is required.

R. Roeckle asked the Applicant to distinguish what would be considered the front, side, and rear of property if the lot line is adjusted. J. Grassi indicated the intent would be for the house to face Walker Drive for consistency, in case the previously proposed road was ever to be built. The Board advised the Applicant to consider setbacks in relation to the original right-of-way configuration, so that future roadway construction would not be impaired. The Board discussed whether a split of the original right-of-way, combined with mutual access easements might be preferable, and whether that is an option.

As the discussion was framed as early feedback for the project, T. Yasenchak advises the Applicant that after they decide which direction they are going to go (variance vs. 40 ft keyhole-lot), when we get to the point of reviewing for this lot line adjustment, the Board will need to see where the existing house is, as well as setbacks, proposed access dimensions, and any easements. The Board advises the Applicant to refine the proposal to also include access width, any required variances, and how the remainder of the parcel will function to not cause hardship for any future buyers.

### **Old Business and Public Hearing**

55 & 65 Wilton Rd LLC, Case # PB 26-006

PUD

TM# 151-2-109

59 Wilton Rd

John Cannie is present representing 55 & 65 Wilton Rd LLC. The Board is continuing its review of preposed updated PUD language for the property at Wilton Road. J. Cannie summarizes revisions submitted after the prior Public Hearing (Public Hearing remains open) and Board comments. Key revisions included:

- Combining three lots into a single tax parcel to resolve setback and internal-ownership complications
- Reducing maximum residential density from 15 to 3 dwelling units
- Revising the proposed “administrative approval” concept: limiting it to agricultural-related changes, lowering the threshold (from 2,000 to 1,000 sq ft site plan modifications), limiting to three consecutive types of these approvals until the Applicant

needs to come back for a full site plan review, and that the administrative approval can only occur after there is at least one initial vote of a site plan by the Town Board, at which point the Applicant's would need to come back to the Planning Board for Site Plan approval.

- Removing certain previously proposed accessory concepts (observation towers and farm stands)
- Clarifying that landscaping, parking, and stormwater are subject to site plan review
- Addressing porches/decks to comply with setbacks consistent with current code.
- Grandfathering of pre-existing non conformant structures that have received Certificate of Occupancy /Compliance, that were shown on previously approved site plan.
- Noting a Code Enforcement site visit/letter indicating no issues have been observed with the manure management are previously discussed.

T. Yasenchak asks the Board if they have any comments regarding the new submissions before re-opening the public hearing. C. Dake is pleased with the single tax parcel and the addition of a minimum lot size. He is, however, still not sold on the idea of administrative approval now. J. Cannie states that it is because it is a farm and they may want to rotate different pastures and have an additional run-in shed or two in a separate location. J. Cannie states he believes there may be a gap in the Town Code as it pertains to agricultural buildings. J. Cannie goes on to talk about a recent site visit with C. Burda (Code Enforcement Officer). He states they had a conversation during that visit regarding the approval process. J. Cannie states the Town Code currently states a building permit is not needed for an agricultural structure that is not human occupied. R. Roeckle mentions that part of the Code will be changing. J. Cannie states it is what is currently in the Code and inquires why it would be necessary to have a site plan approval for a structure that doesn't necessarily need to even be approved from a building permit point of view.

C. Dake comments it seems to be a well-run farm and feels these would be the type of changes that you would know about in advance, and doesn't see the specific harm of coming in for a review.

J. Cannie states he is just trying to treat this farm like other farms that exist in the same area that do not require site plan review for agriculture. T. Yasenchak intervenes to say there may not be requirements in our Code currently for site plan and building permits for agricultural structures, however there are zoning requirements for setbacks. J. Cannie agrees and states setbacks would need to be compliant before they could get administratively approved. T. Yasenchak states that we do not have that tool of administrative action written anywhere in our

current Code, and it would be a big lift to say that you're going to put that in just for you Applicant's PUD. She states that is too much authority to give to people.

S. Liccardi comments he feels 1000 sq ft seems excessive in size in the newly proposed language. R. Roeckle states the new Chapter 54 that was submitted to the Town Board from the Zoning Revision Committee specifically stated that buildings under 144 square feet may or may not need a Building Permit. Agricultural buildings would still need to come before the Town, and the Code Enforcement Officer would need to make the determination on whether the building and its proposed use is an agricultural building. If it is not, a building permit would need to be obtained, and zoning requirements would need to be met. R. Roeckle states that it is his understanding that if the building is deemed agricultural, it would be exempt from is compliance with the NYS Uniform Fire Prevention Building Codes standards. He too expresses concern with 1000 sq ft, saying he would be more comfortable with a number closer to 200 sq ft.

J. Sabanos agrees with many of the comments so far from the Board and states that he would not want to set precedence incorporating something that is not a mechanism that currently exists.

B. Podhajecki comments she agrees that 100 sq ft is excessive, however she believes that 200 sq ft is too small for a run-in shed and thinks 400 ft might be more reasonable. B. Podhajecki talks about how she commends the Applicants for getting a new dumpster for the manure and storing it 50 ft away from the neighboring property line. She suggests perhaps removing the empty cement manure pit that previously was being used and was too close to the neighbor's property, as a neighborly act. T. Yasenchak states that a neighbor recently mentioned the manure pit was in use in a recent Google Earth image. J. Cannie states it is not currently in use and was not in use during the recent site visit with C. Burda.

B. Duffney is in agreeance that 1000 sq ft is too much and would be more comfortable with something closer to 200 ft / 400 ft. and compliant.

J. Sabanos talks about the grandfathering of preexisting non-conforming items that have been previously approved or have CO's. He believes it would be good to clearly define those items, perhaps with a simple list. T. Yasenchak states she agrees with that and points out that she believes that was covered with one of the submitted maps. She asks J. Sabanos if he would like to see anything different than that. He mentions maybe including an attachment with names of the structures along with the square footage. J. Cannie states it was his understanding that was the intention of C. Burda's site visit, and the letter that C. Burda submitted after the visit would trump any map that is submitted. T. Yasenchak states C. Burda did not do a full review of all approvals that have ever been requested of the Applicant. She references to the letter from C.

Burda that stated: "Please note this is not an approval of any zoning conditions or any conditions of the PUD laws which may or may not have been adhered to throughout the development of the properties within the PUD. "J. Sabanos states he is looking at this as a long-term type of situation and wants to make sure we have the best documentation possible to make sure everything is 100% moving forward.

J. Canine states he does not believe a list should be required. He states we have historic surveys, and a Code Enforcement letter that is currently showing there are no outstanding violations. R. Roedle suggests the possibility of having the Code Enforcement Officer create a new letter when we receive the final site plan that comes to the Town after the PUD is approved stating those structures on the map have met and are compliant with Town Code.

T. Yasenchak re-opens the Public Hearing at 8:08 p.m.

Phil Engborg of 5 Pine Robin Rd is present. Mr. Engborg is in support of removing an administrative approval mechanism. He notes that future administrations may apply judgement differently. He is also in support of confirming baseline existing conditions, so that future development is clearly documented.

Vince Walsh of 300 Greene Rd is present. V. Walsh raises concerns about the administrative approval concept, manure pit history and enforcement, potential impacts of internal roads as well as traffic lighting pollution to neighbors. V. Walsh requests clarified documentation of what is considered existing/approved as a baseline and expresses concern that approvals could appear "after the fact" without adequate transparency. V. Walsh also questions what type of agricultural building needs to be 1000 sq ft.

Before the Public Hearing is adjourned, Brian Reichenbach comments cautioning the Board against requiring an Applicant to "prove innocence" regarding alleged violations where Code Enforcement has indicated they have found no violations.

T. Yasenchak adjourns (did not close) the Public Hearing at 8:15 p.m.

T. Yasenchak states that we have a SEAF submitted with this application. She asks B. Reichenbach if property size comes into play when it is legislative. He states it could come into play if it met a certain threshold, however he has reviewed the Handbook and to him, it does not appear to come close to any of the thresholds. In his opinion this would be an unlisted action, so the Board would be free to use a Short Form. He further states that if there is some compelling reason the Board needs further analysis, they could require a Long Form.

T. Yasenchak states since the Applicant is not subdividing, she would be comfortable using the Short Form and asks the Board if they are comfortable using the Short Form. The Board agrees to use Short Form.

T. Yasenchak mentions the Board put in a referral to the County, however the County stated they would not make a determination until the case was in front of the Town Board after the Planning Board issued an advisory opinion.

C. Dake starts comments by saying that he is fine with the map that has been provided. He feels the information on the map provided gives the same information vs. if it was written out in words. C. Dake asks if deciding whether something is an Agricultural Building requires access to the property for someone from the Building Department to determine. The Board answers, no. R. Roeckle states the new Chapter 54 that was submitted to the Town Board for approval, includes the amendment that all buildings regardless shall come to the Building Department to get a building permit, at which time the determination will be made if a building is agricultural or not. The building still needs to meet zoning requirements. If it is deemed to be agricultural, they would not need to meet the Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code requirements.

The Board continues discussion and moves on to discuss the existing residential structures. There are three existing residences on the property: main house, farm managers' house, horse trainers house. The proposed subterranean garage is not considered a residence. J. Cannie states it will qualify as an accessory structure. J. Cannie states there are three residences currently on the property, and there will be no more added unless they subtract one. After further discussion the Board asks J. Cannie to remove Farm Housing from agricultural use in the language and keep agricultural strictly for farming purposes, not housing occupants. J. Cannie states he will confer with his client and does not foresee any issues with that request.

T. Yasenchak moves on to the Lot Line Adjustment that will be part of Site Plan Review to create one lot and asks B. Reichenbach if the PUD says that it is all one lot, will we need to make the Lot Line Adjustment at the time of the PUD, or if it can be done at Site Plan Review after the language has been approved. B. Reichenbach states if that is what the PUD language is going to contemplate, the language of the legislation should make that clear, but it does not need to have a separate step in Site Plan Review. Any modifications or development beyond existing conditions would require the Applicant to return to the Board for additional review.

T. Yasenchak discusses whether the PUD language should include a requirement for submission of a final site plan within a specified timeframe. It is determined by B. Reichenbach that such a requirement would not be necessary. It is acknowledged that the adoption of the PUD would effectively validate existing site conditions, based on submitted surveys and Code Enforcement determinations indicating no violations.

T. Yasenchak begins reviewing draft language outlining permitted uses within the PUD. Members supported the removal of observations towers from the language. T. Yasenchak questions whether they want to include Agricultural Processing in the PUD. The proposed

language does not mention AG Processing and T. Yasenchak points out processing is governed under a separate Town Code. The language drafted would not permit processing activities and would also restrict activities such as washing or preparing goods for sale. The Board acknowledges that agricultural use is permitted, but Agricultural Processing activities are not included.

Next, the Board discusses proposed dimensional standards: Maximum Residential Density of three dwelling units; Minimum lot size of 4-acres. The Board generally supported the proposed dimensional standards. The Board discusses whether to incorporate standards addressing impervious surface coverage. Current Code does not establish specific impervious surface limits, and J. Cannie states he would prefer to remain consistent with current existing code. No impervious surface standards will be added at this time, to adhere to existing Town Code provisions.

The Board moves on to discuss proposed height limit language in the PUD: Agricultural Structures – 50 feet, Residential Structures – 35 feet in the LDR zone. The Board discusses why a height of 50 feet would be required for Agricultural Buildings; however, it is consistent with existing current (LDR) zoning provisions. Any large agricultural structures would still need Site Plan Review.

Parking requirements are discussed (2 spaces per dwelling unit, and 2 spaces per barn/AG building) and deemed reasonable and consistent with expectations.

Setbacks are addressed next. The existing PUD language lists a uniform setback of 20 feet from all lot lines for agricultural structures. The current LDR setback requirements are front – 50 ft, side – 25 feet, rear – 40 feet. It is established that all new structures with need to comply with current LDR setbacks, existing setbacks will be maintained for current existing structures. The Board asks the revised language to align new construction with current LDR setback standards, allow existing structures to remain and be modified without becoming nonconforming, and to clarify lot-line definitions (front, rear, side).

Site Plan Review requirements are discussed. Storm water management will be reviewed during site plan approval. All utilities, including septic systems, must meet applicable State and Local regulations. Landscaping should use native species where practical and be maintained for the life of the PUD. Small accessory structures of 400 feet or less may not require site plan review.

T. Yasenchak indicated SEQRA can proceed once revisions are submitted in a timely manner.

Pat Jarosz of Van Guilder Land Surveyors is here representing the Applicant. This application was reviewed previously by the Board as a 5-lot major subdivision. The Applicant is back in front of the Board having revised the proposal to 2-lots, plus the remaining land. The entire lot is 26 acres. The two proposed residential lots are approximately 3-acres each. P. Jarosz states that remaining land would be subject to future Planning Board approvals prior to any further development. He states proposed lots are located within the MDR2 zone and meet all requirements. Each lot would be served by individual septic systems, and future purchasers would be responsible for obtaining all necessary permits prior to construction.

T. Yasenchak references J. Reckner's (Building Inspector) review letter. The letter indicates the submitted site map shows two zoning compliant lots, being a reduction from the five lots previously submitted. The letter states the Applicant has not shown the details of the driveway construction to show compliance. The letter also states no updated septic designs have been submitted. T. Yasenchak informs Applicant that all the lots must be conforming, and all lots must be capable of having a safe driveway. She states the Board does not approve subdivision of non-compliant lots.

The Applicant asks if it possible to lower the speed limit on that road, relating to site distance. The Board informs the Applicant that request would be at the State level, not the Town. She informs the client it is a lengthy process involving a formal request and traffic studies.

Board Discussion also includes compliance with driveway standards. One measuring 550 feet and one measuring 490 feet. T. Yasenchak informs clients that driveways under 500 feet may not require a midpoint turnaround, however turnarounds would still be required at the residence. It is also noted that C. Baker will need to review the minor subdivision revisions.

The Applicant is directed to revise plans to include:

- Driveway locations and profiles
- Sight distance analysis
- Compliance data for all lots
- Confirm driveway and turnaround compliance

The Applicants are present. They were before the Board previously for a minor subdivision. They were asked to come back with site distance and a stormwater design. The Applicant clarifies the driveway shown on the plans is conceptual, intending to demonstrate the lot is buildable. The exact location has not been finalized and will involve tree clearing and grading. Board members note that while the driveway location could potentially shift slightly, it would need to remain within the same general area evaluated by engineering consultants, particularly with respect to site distance and safety. Any relocation would require compliance with the existing engineering analysis.

While the Applicants did submit site distance, they did not include a stormwater design. They stated they believed that should fall on the responsibility of the future owners. The Board emphasized the stormwater drainage plan was necessary to deem the lot buildable, and that the Board does not approve subdivision of non-conforming lots. The Board informs the Applicant drainage/stormwater details must be shown on the subdivision map before final approval can be granted.

The Board discussed whether a Public Hearing would be necessary for this project. It was established that a Public Hearing may be waived, per Town Code, for such applications. A motion to waive Public Hearing is made.

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: C. Dake

RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby waives Public Hearing in the matter of PB-26-002, Thomas & Linda Chimera for a minor subdivision

VOTES: Ayes: T. Yasenchak, R. Roeckle, J. Sabanos, S. Liccardi, B. Podhajecki

Noes: NONE

Abstain: NONE

T. Yasenchak informs the Applicants once they submit the required information, the Board will be able to make a motion without them going to Public Hearing.

Trevor Flynn of Flynn Design Studios represents the Applicant. T. Flynn provides an overview of revisions submitted previously before the Board including:

- Responses to comments received from the Town Engineer dated 4/7/2026
- Updated septic system design addressing steep slope concerns
- Addition of a storm water, erosion, and sediment control plan
- Submission of exterior lighting specifications
- Clarification of distance measurements, noting the structure is approximately 420 ft from the nearest residence

T. Yasenchak referenced Town Engineer C. Baker's review letter which confirmed that:

- Revised septic systems adequately address slope conditions through a stepped absorption trench system
- Plan scale improvements resolved previous legibility issues
- Stormwater and erosion control measures were added in accordance with earlier recommendations

T. Yasenchak notes the submitted revisions satisfied the Engineer's prior comments.

The Board discusses drainage and site design and confirm the revised plans comply with technical requirements related to septic design and stormwater management.

Significant discussion occurred regarding preservation of existing vegetation and limits on site clearing.

- The Applicant identified the "limit of disturbance" area (shown on plans) as the practical limit of clearing
- Board members expressed concern that clearing should be explicitly constrained beyond the designation to protect visual and environmental conditions
- The Board emphasized that compliance with local requirements that vegetation be preserved to the maximum extent possible

Following discussion, the Board and T. Flynn agreed that toward the pond, clearing shall be limited to the area defined by the limit of disturbance. Toward the western portion of the site, clearing may extend within the defined building envelope to allow reasonable construction

flexibility. The importance of maintaining screening from the roadway to avoid excessive clearing of the parcel.

The Board discussed whether a Public Hearing would be necessary for this project. It was noted that multiple public hearings had previously been conducted for the development on this property and the public was already aware of the project history. It was established that a Public Hearing may be waived, per Town Code Section 105.95. A motion to waive Public Hearing is made.

MOTION: R. Roeckle

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby waives Public Hearing in the matter of PB 25-025, Donald Ferguson Site Plan Review of 345 Plank Road

VOTES: Ayes: T. Yasenchak, C. Dake, J. Sabanos, S. Liccardi, B. Podhajecki

Noes: NONE

Abstain: NONE

A motion is made to approve the Site Plan for Donald Ferguson at 345 Plank Road with the following findings and conditions:

- The Board has waived Public Hearing
- The Applicant submitted revised plans addressing all comments from the Town Engineer's April 7, 2026, review letter
- Stormwater, septic and erosion control requirements have been satisfactorily addressed
- Clearing limits will be explicitly defined in the final determination including restriction to the limit of disturbance toward the pond, and controlled clearing within the building envelope on the western portion of the site.

MOTION: C. Dake

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby grants Site Plan approval for Donald Ferguson at 345 Plank Road.

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

Noes: NONE

Abstain: NONE

---

Meeting Adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

---

Respectfully Submitted By,

Erika Faas

Executive Secretary to the Planning Board