

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MEETING

August 25, 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, R. Roeckle, J. Sabanos, B. Podhajecki and C. Ronk (Alternate). C. Dake and B. Duffney are absent. C. Ronk has full voting privileges. J. Reckner, Building Inspector, is present. E. Faas, Executive Secretary to the Planning Board, is present.

Minutes

July 14, 2026

MOTION: R. Roeckle

SECOND: C. Ronk

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of July 14, 2026, minutes and accepts them as presented.

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

Noes: None

Absent: B. Duffney and C. Dake

Abstain: None

July 28, 2026 – postponed

August 11, 2026 – postponed

Old Business

Gryga, Peter and Blythe – Case # PB 26-023

Advisory Opinion

TM# 123.-2-65

409 Ridge Rd

The Applicant is in front of the Board resuming review of an application concerning open development at 409 Ridge Rd. The matter is before the Board for an advisory opinion to the Town Board. The Applicant sought to construct a single-family dwelling on a lot created through a previously approved subdivision.

The subdivision road was never constructed, and the associated road bond was not put in place, leaving the lot without frontage. The proposed solution is permanent driveway access to Ridge Road through an easement over adjoining land.

The Board reviewed the status of the matter, including prior discussions, the Applicant's proposed driveway access, the proposed easement and maintenance language, and the need for review by the Town Attorney. It was noted that the Town Engineer, C. Baker, had requested attorney review of the easement language, and that the Planning Board had not yet received a response from the Town Attorney at the time of this meeting.

The Board discussed whether additional environmental review was required for the advisory opinion. The file included a SEAF. It was noted that the property was part of an original approved subdivision and that environmental review had been completed in connection with the original subdivision approval. Because the current proposal involves construction of a single-family residence and driveway access on an existing lot within the subdivision, the Board found that the previously completed review was sufficient for purposes of its advisory recommendation and that the proposal would not create an adverse physical or environmental impact beyond what is contemplated in the subdivision approval.

A draft opinion was distributed and reviewed by the Board. The draft stated that the Planning Board was in favor of the Town Board approving open development for the Applicant, subject to the Town Board requiring further review of the driveway easement and maintenance language by the Town Attorney.

The draft summarized the circumstances of the property, including the Applicant's good-faith purchase of the lot, the lack of constructed road access from the original subdivision, the absence of additional land available to obtain frontage on a public way, and the Applicant's negotiation of a permanent easement agreement with an adjacent property owner for driveway access to Ridge Road. During the review, the Board revised language concerning a nearby lot. The discussion clarified that the nearby house appeared to pre-date the subdivision rather than having been created by the same subdivision, and the draft advisory opinion was amended accordingly. The Board also confirmed that the advisory opinion should recommend that the Town Board obtain and consider the Town Attorney's review of the easement and maintenance agreement before making a final determination on the open development application.

A motion is made to accept the Advisory Opinion from the Planning Board and forward it to the Town Board with the discussed revisions.

Motion: B. Podhajecki

Second: J. Sabanos

RESOLVED, the Planning Board accepts the Advisory Opinion in favor of the Town Board approving open development for the Applicants, Peter and Blythe Gryga, at the property located at 409 Ridge Road, TM# 123.-2-65. This Advisory Opinion is being approved and forwarded to the Town Board based on the discussed revisions, as well as the Town Board obtaining and considering the Town Attorney's review of

the easement and maintenance agreement before making a final determination on the open development application.

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

Noes: None

Absent: B. Duffney and C. Dake

Abstain: None

T. Yasenchak instructs E. Faas to make the revisions discussed to the Advisory Opinion then forward it to the Town Board.

Old Business and Public Hearing

Tupelo / Aldrich, William – Case # PB 26-025

SUP

TM# 113.-1-35.1

250 Greene Rd

The Board resumed a Public Hearing on the renewal of the renewable Special Use Permit for Tupelo Community Forest, a privately owned recreational trail facility at 250 Greene Road. The Applicant, W. Aldrich, is present. As well as representative T.J Ruane Esq. of Whiteman, Ostermann and Hannah. T. Ruane referenced a submission made on August 24, 2026, intended to answer comments made during the previous Public Hearing on August 11, 2026. He asked that the Board close the Public Hearing tonight and act on the renewal, with hopes that the renewal would be a permanent one.

T. Ruane asserted that several public comments were mistaken, unverified, or concerned the existence of the trail facility rather than compliance with the permit. He reported that the Town Code enforcement Officer had identified two complaints during the summer: a dump truck parked during authorized parking lot construction, and a vehicle arriving approximately four minutes before opening. He further asserted that the Saratoga County Sherriff's Office as well as the NYSDEC had reported no complaints to their offices. These were assertions made by the Applicant's representative; the Board did not adopt them as conclusive findings at this meeting. T. Ruane stated the facility received a Certificate of Compliance and opened to the public on May 27, 2026. The existing amended renewable SUP was adopted August 12, 2025, and was scheduled to expire August 31, 2026.

Members of the Board discussed the previous approval, noting that several members did not anticipate construction completion to get their Certificated of Compliance to take as long as it did. Members indicated that 10 weeks of being open to the public did not provide enough information about seasonal use, maintenance, wet conditions, fall activity, winter screening effects or a full range of neighborhood impacts.

Before the Public Hearing is re-opened, J. Reckner presents a video to the Board that was emailed to him by Mark Powers of 281 Greene Rd, as well as copies of other recently submitted complaints by neighbors. He plays the short video for the Board that shows a truck driving in and out of the Tupelo parking lot on August 6, 2026, after 9:00 pm. The driver of the truck appears to yell out of his window that he is looking for his lost dog before the video ends.

T. Yasenchak re-opens the Public Hearing at 7:36 p.m.

Mark Powers of 281 Greene Rd- lives across the street from the project. He states that he installed a new camera and has recorded after-hours vehicles driving in and out of the parking lot, as well as users with dogs off their leash. He reported three vehicles on the property after permitted hours during one week, including one after midnight. He expressed concerns regarding the safety of his family, privacy, unmanaged use, and the burden on neighbors.

Erika Walsh of 300 Greene Rd - states that Tupelo's 3 weeks of being open is not a representative operating period. She asserted that short amount of time opened has not given the Board enough time to observe fall trail riding, the effects of leaf blower maintenance, hunting season, early winter darkness and headlights, the effects of wet spring conditions or whether appropriate trail closures would be made during wet conditions, or what a full year of parking while open would look like, as well as trespassing. She also raised concerns that organized events or camps were being organized and advertised despite SUP restrictions against such gatherings.

Tara Baker of 730 Wilton Rd- started off by saying that she was appalled by some people in the public's behavior at the last meeting. She stated that earlier conservation-oriented planning could have reduced effects on wildlife and adjacent neighbors and questioned the placement of the parking lot. She stated that Mr. Aldrich ignored recommendations and, without Planning Board approval, put the parking lot wherever he wanted. She stated that it could have been a beautiful trail if it was planned out appropriately, and believes another year is necessary to see the full impact of the trail officially being open to the public.

Vince Walsh of 300 Greene Rd – Vince Walsh asked the Board if they had received his previous submissions. He went on to state that beaver-control permits had not initially been disclosed and that dams and wildlife on his property had been disturbed, and the trails had expanded beyond the approved three and one half miles approved. He cited public websites describing four miles of trails, and requested revocation of the SUP until compliance was demonstrated.

The Applicant disputed that the facility had expanded and stated that milage differences on GPS websites were not precise.

Karen Wadsworth of 235 Locust Grove Rd – echoed concerns about environmental and neighborhood impacts and urged the Board to assess the project after a full operational year. She stated that Mr. Allrich pushed forward with his project without communication with neighbors, or approvals. She stated that the Community members being impacted were not the ones who asked for, or started this project. She argued that the additional time would allow assessment of the management plan (while also

questioning where the management plan is), parking, trespass, trail maintenance and effects over changing seasons.

The Board discusses whether to adjourn or close the Public Hearing. Members agreed they had gathered enough information from the Applicant and the public to feel comfortable closing the Public Hearing.

T. Yasenchak closes the Public Hearing at 8:00 p.m. Closing the hearing starts a 30-day period for a decision unless otherwise lawfully extended.

The Board worked through the Special Use standards that had supported the previous approval. Members discussed limits on noise; use by individuals rather than organized groups (i.e.: races, fundraisers, schools, camps, etc.); hours of operation 7:00 a.m. to official sunset; mitigation of headlights and illumination through landscape screening; management of trespass and security through stewards and access by the Saratoga County Sherriff's Office.

T. Yasenchak stated that an outside organization appeared to have Tupelo listed as a location for bike rides for kids or organized camps and advised the Applicant to investigate and notify the organization that group use is not authorized under the Special Use Permit. The Applicant stated that he was unaware of any organization using the property as a summer-camp location.

The Board discussed the existing contact information listed on the sign at Tupelo, finding it to be unclear. The sign appeared to direct trail users to volunteer stewards and a QR code, however it did not provide an obvious, readily available telephone number for reporting a problem. Board members asked the Applicant to provide a direct, clear contact for issues regarding security, trespass, or management concerns and to identify when emergency or Sherriff's office should be called. The Applicant stated that the Sherriff's Office had agreed to service the site and they would supply the Board with correspondence verifying such.

Other standards reviewed include adequacy of public services; no on-site trash receptacles; water; sewer; portable toilets; trail modifications requested by the Fire Chief; seasonal closures when conditions warrant; DEC erosion control; wetland and stream crossing oversight; maintenance of brush barriers where trails approach property lines; traffic and parking control; landscaping and screening; absence of exterior lighting; signage; Army Corp and DEC documentation; stormwater compliance; and the fact that the original application was intended to remedy development that occurred before getting Site Plan and Special Use review.

The Board requested confirmation that the required brush barriers were installed, noting that the Certificate of Compliance primarily addressed parking lot work and may not establish compliance with the earlier requirements. Board members agreed they wanted to observe whether the landscaping survived and adequately screened the parking area over a longer time period.

The Board discussed whether the gate should be closed during operating hours to prevent after-hours access to the parking lot. The Applicant stated that the gate had been left open under the approved

management plan to avoid vehicles backing into Greene Rd. J. Reckner advised that if the gate was to be closed in the future, emergency access such as a Fire Department lock should be installed.

Concerning dogs, T. Yasenchak began to clarify the Town's laws regarding dogs on private property, such as this property. She stated that on private property, the Town Law allows dogs to be controlled by leash or voice command on private property. The Board recognized the difficulty of continuous enforcement, but emphasized that the owner, having invited public use onto his private property, should make good faith efforts to prevent users and animals from affecting neighboring properties. During this discussion, T. Yasenchak was repeatedly, very loudly interrupted by resident L. Ramsey. She instructed him that the Public Hearing was over and asked him to lower his voice. The resident proceeded to get louder until he was asked to leave.

T. Yasenchak addressed the issue of trail mileage asking the Applicant to confirm the mileage. The Applicant states no changes have been made and that public GPS sites can be unreliable and vary from site to site and stated that Town of Greenfield Code Enforcement can confirm that at any time. T. Yasenchak stated that our Code Enforcement will not, and are not expected to, go out and walk and measure the trails.

During further discussion, R. Roeckle asks if it would be possible for the Engineer of record for the project to walk the trail and confirm whether any additions have been made. The Applicant asks R. Roeckle if he is referring to the Town Engineer, to which R. Roeckle clarifies it would be their Engineer that worked on the project, not our Town Engineer. After a back-handed comment from a resident, T. Yasenchak states that there is no licensed PE that is going to put their license and their livelihood on the line for any applicant.

The Board agreed that SEQRA review did not need to be reopened because no site-plan change was proposed and the project had already received a negative declaration. It was also noted that the beaver-control activity on private property was beyond the Planning Board's jurisdiction. This discussion regarding SEQRA was discussed toward a future resolution, not a final SEQRA motion at this meeting.

During discussion the consensus of the Board was to consider a further renewable term to be able to review the project again after a full year of being open. June 30, 2027, was discussed as a possible expiration date, allowing for operation through the end of May 2027, and time for a June renewal application.

Additionally, the Board discussed potential continuing conditions to include maintenance of DEC-required stream measures; maintenance work only between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday; continued parking and traffic signage; no facility expansion; compliance with the 7:00a.m. to official sunset hours; and the operational standards reflected in the approved plans and management plans.

Next steps for the Applicant from the Board include:

- Correct the sign from "dawn to dusk" to "7:00 a.m. to official sunset"
- Provide clear contact information for reporting management, trespass or security concerns

- Confirm and, if necessary, complete the brush barriers near property lines and provide photographs
- Investigate unauthorized advertising of group or camp use
- Confirm that the trail layout and mileage remain consistent with the approved site plan
- Continue good-faith efforts to enforce the facilities rules and document responses to problems

Before the next meeting the Board plans to obtain Town Attorney review of the draft renewal language. Because the existing permit would expire August 31, 2026, and the Board is expected to act at its September 8, 2026, meeting, members discussed granting an extension to avoid a technical lapse in the Special Use Permit. A motion is made to extend the permit:

MOTION: R. Roeckle

SECOND: S. Licciardi

RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby extends the existing renewable Special Use Permit for Tupelo Community Forest located at 250 Greene Rd, TM# 113.-1-35.1, from August 31, 2026, through September 15, 2026. It is noted that this is an extension of the Special Use Permit, not the final renewal decision.

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

Noes: None

Absent: B. Duffney and C. Dake

Abstain: None

T. Yasenchak asks if there is any additional business. E. Faas states that beginning the next meeting, Town meetings will be video recorded to be posted on the Town's website.

T. Yasenchak takes a moment to address the Public before the meeting is adjourned. She states that we are a Planning Board and we have a process that we follow, and we have certain rules, regulations, and standards that we need to follow when we discuss applications. It is not the job of the Board to police neighbors. She encouraged everyone to act like good neighbors, and if you have a problem with one another, try to talk to each other and communicate openly.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:27 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Erika Faas

Secretary to the Planning Board

DRAFT