

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MEETING

July 28, 2026

Regular Meeting

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by T. Yasenchak, Chair, at 7:00 p.m. On Roll call the following Board members are present: T. Yasenchak, S. Licciardi, J. Sabanos, R. Roeckle, B. Podhajecki, B. Duffney and C. Ronk (Alternate). C. Dake is absent. C. Ronk has full voting privileges. J. Reckner, Building Inspector, is absent. E. Faas, Executive Secretary to the Planning Board, is present.

Minutes

July 14, 2026 – postponed

New Business

Paul, Pileckas – Case # PB 26-026

SPR/SUP

TM# 164.-1-32.141

32 Mill Rd

P. Pileckas is present. The Applicant is in front of the Board for Site Plan Review and a Special Use Permit for contractor storage at 32 Mill Road. He explained that the property was being used for storage of building materials, equipment, trailers and related contractor items.

The purpose of this appearance before the Board was to determine how this use fits within the Town zoning code and what approvals or additional information would be required before the Board could act on the application.

The Board performed a zoning review and established that the property is located in the MDR-1 zoning district and that the parcel appears to meet the minimum lot size requirement for the proposed use as it is larger than 10-acres (13.56-acres). The Board discussed whether the proposed lot should be reviewed as a small or larger contractor storage yard. A large contractor yard was described as a lot used to store and maintain construction equipment and materials with limits related to the number of vehicles over 26,000 lbs.; whereas a small contractor yard allows fewer large, registered vehicles. The Board suggested proceeding under the large contractor storage yard category to avoid unnecessary disputes over the number of vehicles on site, stating the review process would be the same.

The Board discussed frontage requirements including whether the parcels function as a keyhole lot. A member stated that because the code does not clearly differentiate keyhole lots from other lots for this purpose, the Board should not assume a frontage problem unless the Zoning Enforcement Officer provides a written determination saying the property does not comply.

The most important zoning issue discussed was that in the MDR-1 district, a contractor storage yard may only be permitted in connection with a principal permitted use, unless the property was located in an Industrial Zone. The Board reviewed the list of principal permitted uses in the MDR-1 district and established the permitted uses are residential in nature: single-family dwelling, mobile home, or two-family dwelling. Some form of residential use would need to be established before the contractor storage yard could be approved. The Applicant discussed other means of meeting the requirements with the Board including a mobile home, or pole barn or workshop with a living space, sleeping area, kitchenette and bathroom. Board members emphasized the use would need to satisfy code definition and be acceptable to Code Enforcement.

The Board advised the Applicant of the next steps to move forward with review of the project:

- Revised Site Plan to include proposed location of residence, septic, well, storage areas, trailer/vehicle locations, access points, buffering, and any other relevant information.
- Narrative outlining Special Use Permit Criteria A-Q (i.e.: use, operational details, number of employees, hours of operation, anticipated traffic, etc.)

A Public Hearing is set for August 11, 2026. The Board notes that as long as the Applicant is actively pursuing the required approvals and continues moving through the process, enforcement action may not be taken.

Tupelo – Aldrich, W. – Case # PB 26-025

SPR/SUP

TM# 113.-1-35.1 & 35.2

250 & 280 Greene Rd

C. Gottlieb of Whiteman, Osterman & Hanna is present representing the Applicant, W. Allrich. C. Gottlieb explained that project improvements had been completed, the site opened for use in late May of this year, and the Applicant is seeking permanent renewal to their Special Use Permit, rather than continuing a renewable permit cycle.

C. Gottlieb stated the completions included stormwater work, stabilization, stream crossings, and installation of required signage. Documentation from the NYSDEC confirming the stormwater permit was closed on July 10, 2026, was provided, as well as documentation of the Certificate of Compliance issued by the Town of Greenfield Building Department.

The Board clarifies that the Certificate of Compliance confirms that Site Plan and Special Use Permit conditions were met, however it should not be confused with the Special Permit renewal itself. Original approval requirements were discussed by the Board including stream crossing mitigation, DEC inspection, maintenance obligations, signage, parking restrictions and limitation that the Community Forest not be expanded without further Board review.

T. Yasenchak addressed a concern raised through a FOIL request regarding a possible DEC nuisance permit related to beaver activity. She noted that wildlife regulation, including trapping or nuisance permits, is generally under DEC jurisdiction rather than Planning Board land use authority. She advised C. Gottlieb to be prepared to address the issue if it comes up at the Public Hearing.

A public hearing is set for August 11, 2026. C. Gottlieb asked whether the project could continue operating if the current permit expiration date passes before the Board issued a final determination. T. Yasenchak indicated that because the renewal request had been initiated before the expiration date, the matter could continue through the Planning Board review process, while remaining open. No resolution is adopted at this time.

Old Business and Public Hearing

Cuccio, Chris - Case # PB 26-021
TM# 125.-1-13.3

SUP
4006 NYS Rt 9N

T. Yasenchak recuses herself having previously designed a foundation for the Applicant. R. Roeckle takes over as Chair for this case. C. Cuccio is present. He is in front of the Board looking to obtain a Special Use Permit for a studio apartment.

The Board reviewed additional information submitted by the Applicant as requested by the Board at the prior meeting. This included:

- The proposed well setback
- The proposed building location
- The location of the future house
- The septic location
- Driveway information

C. Cuccio stated that a NYS DOT driveway permit had been obtained, and the Board accepted that the DOT had reviewed the driveway location and site distance. The Board members agree that the submitted materials are adequate.

R. Roeckle opens the Public Hearing at 7:55 p.m. No members of the public spoke for or against the project. The public hearing is closed at 7:56 p.m.

The Board then reviewed the SEAF under SEQRA. During review R. Roeckle corrected/clarified several items: the action did not involve legislative adoption, the NYSDOT driveway approval was applicable, potable water would be provided by private well, and wastewater would be handled by private septic. The Applicant initials the corrections. After completing Part two of the SEAF, the Board found no moderate-to-large impacts and determined that the proposed action would not result in any adverse environmental impacts.

A motion is made to check the second determination box, constituting a negative declaration:

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: J. Sabanos

RESOLVED, the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts based on the Negative Declaration determined during SEQRA, and any supporting documentation.

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

Noes: None

Absent: C. Dake

Abstain: T. Yasenchak

A motion is next made to approve C. Cuccio's application for a studio apartment;

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: S. Licciardi

RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby approves the application of C. Cuccio for a studio apartment located at 4006 NYS Rt 9N, TM# 125.-1-13.3, with no additional contingencies.

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

Noes: None

Absent: C. Dake

Abstain: T. Yasenchak

English, Edward and Carol - Case # PB 26-022
TM# 125.-2-80

Minor Subdivision
725 Locust Grove Rd

C. Cartier of Cartier Construction is present representing the Applicant. C. Cartier explains they have provided the additional information the Board requested at the last meeting, including:

- Sight distances for lot-2
- Well and septic locations
- Proposed house and barn locations
- Driveway information

The Board noted that the Town Engineer's review requested additional plan notes, including certification regarding sight distance measurements. The discussion clarified that the sight-distance notes should state the measurements were completed in accordance with applicable AASHTO standards and should identify the requires actual stopping sight distances at the intersection. C. Cartier agreed to add this information.

T. Yasenchak opened the Public Hearing at 8:09 p.m. C. Cohen gave a brief description of the project explaining that the proposal involved restoring a former lot line configuration after a prior lot line

adjustment had reduced the number of lots. The parcel historically included 3-lots, was reduced to 2-lots through a prior adjustment and is now proposed to return to 3-lots.

Dr. J. Streit of Locust Grove Rd asked whether the application involved two building lots. The Board clarified that one lot already contained an existing home and the proposal would result in only one new building lot.

T. Yasenchak closed the Public Hearing at 8:11 p.m. and continued to SEQRA review. T. Yasenchak made minor clarifications to the APPLICANT'S Part 1 responses including energy code compliance, on-site well and septic, wetland or waterbody information and threatened/endangered species considerations. The Applicant initials the changes. The Board completed Part 2 and found no moderate-to-large impacts.

A motion was made to check the second determination box indicating a negative declaration:

MOTION: J. Sabanos

SECOND: C. Ronk

RESOLVED, the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts based on the Negative Declaration determined during SEQRA, and any supporting documentation.

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

Noes: None

Absent: C. Dake

Abstain: None

Following SEQRA determination, the Board discussed whether to move forward with approval of the subdivision. Members indicated they had no further questions for the Applicant. The Board discussed approval subject to conditions identified in the Town Engineer's review letter. This included adding notes regarding sight distance and disturbance of less than 1-acre.

A motion is made to approve the subdivision with contingencies:

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: B. Podhajecki

RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby approves the application of Edward and Carol English for a minor subdivision at 725 Locust Grove Rd, TM# 125.-2-80, contingent upon:

- Adding notes regarding site distance and disturbance of less than 1-acre to maps per the Town Engineer's review letter
- Review and approval of the revisions by Town Engineer before mylar and paper maps may be signed and filed with the County

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

Noes: None

Absent: C. Dake

Abstain: None

Old Business

Fashion Floors of Saratoga – Case# PB 26-024
TM# 153.13-1-19

SPR
644 Nys Rt 9N

P. Mound, the Applicant and owner of Fashion Floors of Saratoga, is present. The Applicant is in front of the Board continuing a Site Plan Review regarding a change of occupancy for an existing commercial building. The Board clarifies that this is a Site Plan Review, not an application for a Special Use Permit, since the property is in the Office Residential Zone. The Applicant is proposing to move his business from one commercial location to another existing commercial location.

P. Mound submitted the available site plan information from the property owner, noting the original survey was destroyed in a flood. P. Mound also submitted an ariel image showing the existing access, parking, ramp, building and layout.

Members of the Board are satisfied with the recent submissions. J. Sabanos asks about signage. The Applicant states that he will be replacing the old existing sign on the property with his own. R. Roeckle reads sign requirements to the Applicant.

The Board reviewed parking space requirements and determined that available parking was sufficient, including parking for the upstairs residential apartment (not being leased by the Applicant). The Board noted that no new site disturbance, buffering, stormwater review, or expanded site plan review appeared to be necessary because the site was already developed and commercially used. No SEQRA is necessary.

The Board makes a motion to approve the application for Site Plan Review:

MOTION: R. Roeckle

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby approves the application for Site Plan Review of 644 NYS Rt 9N, TM# 153.13-1-19, submitted by Paul Mound of Fashion Floors of Saratoga noting the Board has determined that:

- **No SEQRA was required**
- **Existing parking meets the requirements of the Office Residential Zone and is reuse of an existing commercial site**

Approval is contingent upon:

- **The Applicant going through the correct permit process when replacing the business sign and meets the Code requirements for size**
- **Although the sign is not shown on the site plan, the Applicant has indicated the new sign will be on the existing poles/posts as seen on the ariel map submitted**

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

Noes: None

Absent: C. Dake

Abstain: None

Romano, Jon - Case # PB 25-026
TM# 138.-1-97.3

Minor Subdivision
24 Bump Hill Rd

P. Jarosz of Van Guilder Surveyors is present representing the Applicant. The Board is continuing the review of an application submitted by J. Romano for a 3-lot minor subdivision located at 24 Bump Hill Rd.

The Board discussed the Town Engineers' review letter to the Applicant's most recently submitted revisions, including confirmation that the revised grading plans proved adequate detail, the sight-distance certifications for the proposed driveways, and the potential need for NYS stormwater permit coverage through the filing of a Notice of Intent because total project disturbance may exceed 1-acre. Town Engineer, C. Baker, stated in his letter that:

- The revised plans (Site/Grading Plan and ESC Plan) provide the detailed grading and drainage plan details, and Erosion and Sediment Controls, that were previously requested. The revised plans provide sufficient detail to show the maximum extent of grading that will be required to build the proposed driveways. The plans and SWPPP provide the required documentation for the applicant to obtain coverage under the NYSDEC Stormwater General Permit.
- The Site/Grading Plan prepared by Steenburgh contains a table providing available and required sight distances for each driveway location. A certification note should be added to the table that states the sight distances were measured in accordance with the American Association of Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), and the distances meet the minimum intersection sight distance for the posted speed of the road
- The Site/Grading Plan and ESC Plans include a clearing and grading limit line for each lot, as well as a detailed grading and drainage plan that defines the limits of clearing and grading for each lot. The total amount of disturbance for the proposed subdivision exceeds one acre and therefore requires the filing of a Notice of Intent (NOI) to obtain coverage under the NYSDEC Stormwater General Permit.
- A basic SWPPP was provided with the most recent project submittals. I suggest that prior to issuance of the final subdivision approval, the applicant provide verification of NYS Stormwater

General Permit (GP) coverage. To obtain permit coverage the applicant must electronically file the NOI (copy included with the SWPPP), and once that is deemed acceptable by the NYSDEC they will issue permit coverage verification. Prior to submitting the NOI, the applicant must complete the MS4 SWPPP Acceptance Form (copy included with the SWPPP) and request the Town of Greenfield MS4 compliance officer (Cory Burda) to sign the request.

- All proposed driveways should be designed in accordance with the criteria identified in town code Section 105-137 (keyhole lots). All proposed driveways should provide turnouts for emergency vehicles, as well as turnaround locations at the proposed house locations. All these locations should be identified on the detailed grading and drainage plan and are subject to review and approval by the town fire code official
- The planning Board may consider submission of a LEAF should they be concerned with the amount of clearing and grading that will be required to construct the proposed driveways and homes.

T. Yasenchak reopens the Public Hearing at 8:47 p.m.

Ken Cole of 75 South Greenfield Rd – raised concerns about washout onto the road and asks the Board if they have considered this.

T. Yasenchak stated the Town Engineer had reviewed this, and the Applicant satisfied the requirements.

T. Yasenchak closed the Public Hearing at 8:50 p.m.

The Board completed SEQRA review. During review of Part 2 it is determined that the proposed action would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts. A motion is made to check the second determination box on Part 3, declaring a negative impact:

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: J. Sabanos

RESOLVED, the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts based on the Negative Declaration determined during SEQRA, and any supporting documentation.

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

Noes: None

Absent: C. Dake

Abstain: None

The Board agrees to make a motion to conditionally approve the application for the 3-lot subdivision of 24 Bump Hill Rd submitted by J. Romano.

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: S. Licciardi

RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby approves the application submitted by J. Romano for a 3-lot minor subdivision of 24 Bump Hill Rd, TM # 138.-1-97.3, contingent upon:

- The Town Engineer's requirements being satisfied
- A final review of revisions being reviewed and verified to be satisfactory by the Town Engineer
- The Applicant has 180 days to satisfy the conditions and provide the necessary materials for final processing

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

Noes: None

Absent: C. Dake

Abstain: None

Saratoga Escape – Case # PB 26-018
TM# 126.-1-81.1

SUP
265 Brigham Rd

The Applicants are present, as well as C. Gottlieb representing them from Whiteman, Osterman & Hanna. They are in front of the Board regarding the requested transfer of the existing Special Use Permit for the campground property. C. Gottlieb explained the campground has operated since approximately 1980 and that potential new owners sought Planning Board review and approval of the transfer before closing on the property, so that the existing Special Use Permit would not lapse or become invalid upon transfer of ownership. He went on to explain that the Town's historic records for the campground are limited, however it was found that a Special Use Permit had previously been granted and later amended. The files on record did not contain a clear record of all campground approvals, making it difficult to establish a baseline identifying the conditions of the SUP. For this reason, the Board had previously requested a written campground narrative as well as an updated survey so that they could establish a clear baseline identifying the campground operations, structures, campsites, amenities, and site conditions that would continue under new ownership.

C. Gottlieb read through the proposed narrative. Existing campground operations presented included:

- 111 existing RV sites
- 8 cabins, including 1 cabin used for an on-site caretaker
- 1 glamping tent site
- 3 regular tent sites
- 2 sites usable for either tents or RVs.
- Total of 126 camping spaces
- Seasonal operation from April through early December
- Quiet hours of 10:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. on weekdays, and 11:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. on weekends.
- Existing accessory features include a general store, pool, splash pad, bathhouse, mini golf, canoes, paddle boards, snack bar, sports courts, campground roads and walkways, fire pit, picnic tables and related campground amenities.

C. Gottlieb continues to read through narrative. The Board addresses several items in the narrative. T. Yasenchak states the narrative should use definitive language, rather than term such as “typically”, “generally” or “from time to time”, because the SUP should clearly state what is approved and avoid subject interpretation. This was not limited to but included the quiet hours and operational hours. The Applicant agrees to adjust the language to be more concise.

The Board discussed special events/ concerts listed in the narrative. The Board clarifies that any concerts or special events must remain accessory to campground use and primarily for campground guests. They expressed concern that that references to “local concerts” could imply a public concert or mass gathering use, which would require separate reviews and approvals. The Applicant agreed to revise the narrative to avoid using language that would suggest a mass gathering or public assembly use.

The Board reviewed the list of current and potential future campground features listed in the narrative and directed that the list be limited to current existing features only. Including but not limited to future improvements or expansions, including any RV septic hook-ups, additional facilities, new trails, new recreational features, or other changes would require future Planning Board review and any necessary amendment to the SUP. Anything listed on this narrative that doesn’t currently exist cannot be transferred to the SUP (i.e.; pony rides, horseback riding lessons, dog park, pickleball, etc.). T. Yasenchak noted that docks in the pond cannot be included and cannot be regulated by the Town, it is a matter for the DEC.

The Board discussed sanitary facilities and noted that the campground has an existing septic system serving current bathrooms and facilities, however RV sites are not currently connected to individual septic hook-ups. Currently, RV’S can get pumped out, or can discharge it into an on-site dump station. A note to add “on-site” to the narrative is made by T. Yasenchak as well as modification to the SUP if any future septic improvements or RV hook-ups that would require further review.

The Applicant previously stated that the purchase contract includes both the campground parcel and a separate residential parcel. The Board clarified that the SUP transfer applies only to the campground parcel, described as apx 81.84 acres, and does not extend to the separate residential parcel. C. Gottlieb stated that after closing, the new owners intend to pursue a lot merger, returning to the Board for any required amendment to the SUP if the residential parcel is to be incorporated into the campground use. T. Yasenchak further states that approval of the SUP transfer is not a site plan approval and does not legalize, or waive any existing or potential zoning, parcel setback, property line, building, or site condition violations. Any such issues remain subject to applicable review, correction, or enforcement outside of the SUP transfer. T. Yasenchak also makes it clear that the Planning Board is not requiring the Applicant to purchase the residential lot and include it in the SUP. The residential lot is not included in the SUP.

The Board discusses whether a Public Hearing is required for a transfer of a SUP and concludes that the code provision governing transfer did not require a Public Hearing for this action. The Board discussed whether a temporary one-year approval would be appropriate, however it was determined that the transfer review was limited to whether the existing campground use had been, and was being, conducted consistently with the existing SUP, rather than creating a new permit term.

A motion is made to approve the transfer of the existing Special Use Permit for the campground use to the new owners under contract, based on the Applicant’s submitted narrative as corrected and clarified during the meeting.

MOTION: R. Roeckle

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby approves the transfer of the existing Special Use Permit for Saratoga Escape Lodges & RV Resort located at 265 Brigham Rd, TM# 126.-1-81.1, to the new property owners under contract. This approval is based on the narrative provided to the Board and the corrections made by Chairperson T. Yasenchak. This approval is not inclusive of a site plan review and does not infer the approval of any site conditions that may be in violation of any Town Codes.

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

Noes: None

Absent: C. Dake

Abstain: None

Meeting Adjourned at 9:58 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted By,

Erika Faas

Executive Secretary to the Planning Board