

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MEETING

September 8, 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, C. Dake, B. Duffney, R. Roeckle, J. Sabanos, B. Podhajecki and C. Ronk (Alternate). C. Ronk has full voting privileges. E. Faas, Executive Secretary to the Planning Board, is present.

Minutes

July 28, 2026

During approval on July 28, 2026, R. Roeckle states that prior approval described as a “studio apartment” for case # PB 26-021, Chris Cuccio, located at 4006 NYS Rt 9N, was an application for a “studio”. The minutes do not need to be adjusted; however, we will need to re-open and re-approve the case as a “studio” at the end of this meeting.

July 14, 2026

MOTION: R. Roeckle

SECOND: B. Podhajecki

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, and B. Duffney

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: C. Dake

August 11, 2026

MOTION: C. Dake

SECOND: J. Sabanos

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of August 11, 2026, minutes and accepts them as presented.

VOTE: Ayes: R. Roeckle, J. Sabanos, B. Podhajecki, C. Ronk, and C. Dake.

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: S. Licciardi, T. Yasenchak, and B. Duffney

August 25, 2026 – Postponed

New Business

Carroll, Leo – Case # PB 26-030

Minor Subdivision

TM# 124.-1-2

541 Ridge Rd

Suzzane Miller is present representing the Applicant. S. Miller gives a narrative of the case stating that the proposal involves four conforming lots with conforming road frontage, requiring no variances. She explained that a similar subdivision had been presented to and approved by the Board in 2013, subject to road improvements to turn-arounds. The Town completed the roadwork, including widening and gravel improvements. However, the Applicant did not return to complete the approval process or file the subdivision. The map submitted in the application was prepared or updated in 2016, after the roadwork was complete. S. Miller stated that the proposed subdivision layout has not changed.

T. Yasenchak notes that because the prior approval was never completed and filed, the current application must be reviewed under present-day submission standards. It is also noted that applicable zoning has not changed since that time.

The Board discussed whether Ridge Road extends as a Town road to the edge of the property. The available tax map appeared to show the road continuing to the property. While in the past the Town maintained or plowed only as far as the last occupied house, minutes from 2013 provided by the Applicant stated that maintenance would extend farther if homes were constructed farther down the road.

T. Yasenchak states the Board may need to see an updated site map. Members of the Board agree, stating the revised plan must demonstrate that all 4 lots satisfy frontage and area requirements, as well as:

- Potential house locations on all 4-lots
- Building envelopes and setback lines
- Potential well and septic locations
- Topographic information and detailed grading where applicable
- Limits are clearing for each lot

- Proposed driveway locations and grading details, as well as site-distance information for each driveway
- A minor SWPPP addressing the subdivision as a whole
- A revised SEQRA Part 1 based on potential development of all 4-lots

E. Faas is instructed to send the application to the Town Engineer for review. A Public Hearing is set to be scheduled for September 29, 2026.

Old Business

English, Edward & Carol – Case # PB 26-022

Re-Approval Minor Subdivision

TM# 125.-2-80

725 Locust Grove Rd

This Minor Subdivision located at 725 Locust Grove Road was approved on July 28, 2026. However, it needed County referral since there is a working farm within 500 ft of the property. The County sent the Board a memorandum of understanding saying that they reviewed the application and have no issues with the Minor Subdivision. T. Yasenchak states that the Board needs to acknowledge the memorandum and that nothing has changed with the application and provide a re-approval.

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: S. Licciardi

RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby re-opens and re-approves the Minor Subdivision submitted by Edward & Carol English located at 725 Locust Grove Road, TM# 125.-2-80, noting the Board has received a memorandum of understanding from the County that this subdivision has no impacts on the agricultural district, nor the working farm within 500 ft of the property.

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

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: B. Podhajecki

C. Dake recuses himself. C. Gottlieb is present representing the Applicant. He gives an updated narrative of his most recent submissions and responses to questions raised by the public and Planning Board. He stated that the Public Hearing was closed on the August 25, 2026, meeting and that submission revisited the Special Use Permit standards to confirm that circumstances had not changed since the Community Forest was approved. The submission addressed:

- Hours and Signage – approved operating hours remain 7:00 a.m. to official sunset. Earlier signage referring to sunrise-to-sunset hours were replaced. The updated rules sign now states the approved hours and includes a direct phone number for the trail steward
- Site Rules – existing rules remain in effect, including the requirement that dogs be leashed, prohibition on motorized vehicles, prohibition on lighting or headlamps, and prohibition on organized events.
- Organized Events- the approval is for individual users only. Prohibited group activities include races, bike rallies, fundraisers, school events, workshops, camps, and use as a training facility. The Applicant contacted the Shedder's Mountain Biking Club, and the program director confirmed that the organization had not hosted group rides, camps, or any other programs.
- Property-line Controls- Downed trees and brush barriers were installed near trails that approach adjoining property lines. Photographs provided show the barriers, yellow property-line markers and no-trespassing signs.
- Complaints and Enforcement- the Saratoga County Sheriff's Department reported no complaints. A response from the NYSDEC remained pending.
- Site and Infrastructure- No buildings or infrastructure are proposed. The site consists of trails, a gravel parking area, and stormwater facilities. Trails were widened during construction in response to Fire Chief comments concerning emergency access.
- Environmental Compliance – Applicant stated the Town and DEC stormwater approvals had been closed out, wetland and buffer disturbance had been avoided, stream-crossing and stormwater permits had been completed, and the site remained compliant with zoning setbacks, disturbance limits, and lot-coverage requirements.
- Parking and Compatibility- observed use generally involved no more than 4 or 5 vehicles, leaving parking spaces available. The Applicant stated that the use remained compatible with surrounding State Park land and nearby residential property and did not prevent the development of adjoining parcels.
- Agency Approvals- the project had received a Certificate of Compliance, the site plan remained valid, and the Applicant characterized the renewal as a Type II action exempt from further SEQRA review.

T. Yasenachak distributed a revised renewal resolution prepared after consulting with the Town Attorney to review with the Board. The review included:

- Resolution records that the Applicant fulfilled the 2025 site-plan requirements, received a Certificate of Compliance, made no impactful changes to the approved site plan, and had no reported violations.
- The Board determined that there were no substantive changes warranting renewed environmental review or re-opening the prior SEQRA determination. The resolution reaffirms the prior negative declaration.

- Because the approved site plan was built and no updated materials showing site-plan changes were presented, the Board determined that the additional site-plan review was not required.

Operating Standards and Conditions:

- Use is limited to non-motorized recreational bicycling and individual users
- Organized races, rallies, fundraisers, school programs, workshops, camps and operations as a training facility are prohibited
- Hours are 7:00 a.m. to official sunset. The facility must close when headlamps or bike lights are required
- No exterior lighting is permitted
- A posted, direct, accessible 24-hour contact number must be maintained for immediate assistance. The Saratoga County Sheriff must be permitted to access the property.
- The maintenance plan remains in effect. Maintenance records must be kept and made available to the Town Code Enforcement Official upon request and to the Planning Board during future renewals.
- Brush, rocks, downed trees and similar barriers must be placed and maintained where trails approach property lines so that their purpose is clear and continue to discourage off-trail travel and trespass.
- Community infrastructure and services were found adequate. No water, sewer, on-site trash receptacles, portable toilets, or school serves are required. Emergency access improvements requested by the Fire Chief have been completed.
- The site must be closed when seasonal conditions could produce erosion or harm adjacent wetlands.
- No-parking signs along Greene Rd, parking area bollards, and signage stating parking limits must remain in place and in good visual condition
- Existing screening and landscaping must be maintained. The Applicant must replant as needed to remain consistent with the approved site plan, and adequacy will be evaluated at renewal.
- Existing trails and parking may not be enlarged, and the facility may not be expanded in any way.
- Stream-mitigation measures required by DEC must continue and be maintained.
- All site maintenance must occur during regular business hours, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.
- The Applicant's submittal materials and approved site-plan materials are incorporated as standards and operating conditions on the permit.

T. Ysenchak states that the applicant is responsible for applying for renewal or extension before expiration. If the permit is not renewed or extended before the expiration date, the SUP may be discontinued. Future renewal is not guaranteed. A future Planning Board may impose additional requirements after reviewing the site and its operations. Any expansion, alteration or variation requires a new SUP and review under Article 6. The permit is not valid under a change in property ownership unless the transfer requirements of Town Code are satisfied.

A motion is made to approve the renewed resolution as read and with the agreed upon revisions that occurred during the meeting.

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: S. Licciardi

RESOLVED, the Planning Board makes the following determination:

1. The Planning Board re-affirms that no significant adverse environmental impacts will result from the action, deciding not to re-open SEQRA discussion and accepting the original Negative Declaration pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act; and
2. The site plan has been approved, built, and received a Certificate of Compliance from the Town Building Department. No updated materials depicting changes to the Site Plan have been presented, therefore re-review of the Site Plan is not required.
3. A renewable Special Use Permit is herein granted through June 30, 2027. Such permit may be renewable for successive periods, or permanently, as authorized by further order of this Planning Board, on condition that the Applicant continue to comply with all of the aforementioned Standards A-Q, also considered as "operating conditions" by which the Special Use Permit was review and listed, in addition to the conditions listed
 - A) The Special Use Permit shall expire upon change in property ownership or property transfer unless conditions noted in section 105-59 of the Town of Greenfield Zoning Code are met
 - B) A new Special Use Permit shall be required for the expansion, alteration, or variation of the use already authorized by this Special Use Permit and shall be subject to the application and review procedures described in Article VI: Special Use Permits.

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

Noes: None

Abstain: C. Dake

Absent: None

Cuccio, Chris – Case # PB 26-021

Re-Approval

TM # 125.-1-13.3

4006 NYS Rt 9N

A motion is made to re-open and re-approve case # PB 26-021:

MOTION: R. Roeckle

SECOND: J. Sabanos

RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby re-opens and re-approves the application by C. Cuccio, 4006 NYS Rt 9N, TM# 125.-1-13.3, as a Studio, not a Studio Apartment.

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

Noes: None

Abstain: T. Yasenchak

Absent: None

Old Business and Public Hearing

Saratoga PLAN, Case # PB 26-017
TM# 126.-1-24.111

SUP/SPR
Northern Gateway/Graphite Range

T. Roberts gives a short narrative of the project. Saratoga PLAN is in front of the Board seeking Site Plan review and Special Use Permit approval for the Northern Gateway project on an approximately 20.5-acre parcel along Wilton-Greenfield Rd. The property is presently owned by Saratoga PLAN. After construction, they intend to transfer the parcel to Saratoga County for management as part of the Graphite Range Community Forest. The proposal consists of a half-mile trail, 10-space parking area, trailhead signage, a boardwalk, and related access and drainage improvements. Five parking spaces are proposed to be reserved for visitors who may benefit from an accommodation, including older residents and families with young children. The project is intended to provide a less strenuous northern entrance to the existing Graphite Range trail network.

Board discussion began with an initial focus on trail safety, permitted uses, and day-to-day operations. The Board asked the Applicant to clarify whether the trail was meant to be an “accessible trail” or whether it was to be designed as “easier access”. The Applicant clarified that the project is not intended to meet every federal accessibility guideline, or to be advertised as a fully accessible trail system. The Applicant stated the proposed trail would accommodate hiking, biking, cross-country skiing and snowshoeing. The application initially relied on the Graphite Range Management Plan, which permits pedal-assisted e-bikes. When asked about speed limitations with e-bike usage, T. Roberts stated that it was 15 mph and under. Members questioned whether bicycles traveling at that speed would be compatible with a narrow trail used potentially by young children, strollers, older residents and people with mobility issues. The Board requested a clear, consistent statement of permitted use and speed restrictions. The Applicant stated they would consider not allowing e-bikes.

Trail width was also discussed. Some members were concerned that three feet could be inadequate for safe passing or emergency response. The Board requested the Applicant to seek review by the Greenfield Fire District so emergency personnel can assess trail access, width, rescue needs, and whether portions of the route should accommodate an emergency vehicle or side-by-side unit.

The Board indicated that operating hours should generally align with a similar project involving community forest use: 7:00 am. To official sunset. Members discussed whether a gate should be opened

and closed daily to discourage after-hours use. The Board brought up seasonal and condition-based closures to avoid trail damage and unsafe conditions.

The Board requested a separate maintenance plan addressing parking lot plowing and who would be responsible, trail upkeep, seasonal closures, erosion prevention, wet-weather management, hours for maintenance work, inspection practices, and responsibility of responding to complaints. Since the site will remain private property during the approval process, the Board also requested written confirmation from the Saratoga County Sheriff that law-enforcement personnel may enter the property for emergencies, disturbances, trespass, or other incidents.

The Board requested a readable enlargement of the proposed trailhead sign showing rules, hours, allowed use and speed limits if allowing e-bikes, a direct contact number and directions to use the Route 9 lot when the ten Northern Graphite Range spaces are full. The Board also requested bollards or other clear markers for all spaces so vehicles cannot be crowded into unmarked areas or park beyond the approved capacity. T. Yasenchak also asked for confirmation from the Town Engineer regarding driveway grade and site distance, as Wilton-Greenfield Rd has fast moving traffic, a passing zone, curves, and a dip that may affect visibility.

The Board requested further review of screening on both sides of the developed area, although the Applicant did add native plantings near the parking lot in response to earlier comments. Members were particularly concerned about view from nearby homes toward the driveway, drainage features, and parking lot, especially during winter months. The Applicant was asked to identify existing vegetation, provide photographs, state the mature height of proposed plantings, and revise the landscaping plan if necessary to establish a year-round buffer.

The Applicant stated that the project avoids regulated wetlands and would cross a small stream by a boardwalk without disturbance. The Applicant stated they are "streams not wetlands" and that it is not regulated by DEC or the Army Corp. The Board requests the Applicant to provide written clarification from the DEC/Army Corp of Engineers, stating that the jurisdiction and supporting materials are unclear.

T. Yasenchak re-opens the Public Hearing at 9:21 p.m.

Tara Baker of 430 Wilton Rd - Opposes the trail as currently proposed, however said there needs to be a compromise. She raised concerns about increased bicycle traffic, including riders traveling up from Route 9, as well as pointing out the weight of e-bikes and how heavy they are, emphasizing safety concerns. She appreciated the Board suggesting the hours of operation they did, stating she already deals with light pollution at her house from headlights from a neighboring cell tower parking lot, and believes that the same thing will happen with this new proposed parking lot. She pointed out how much litter she finds on her front lawn, that it makes it difficult to mow. She stated how dangerous the road there is with speed and site distance. She asked whether the parking lot could be shifted as a compromise.

Vince Walsh, 300 Greene Rd- Characterized the proposal as an expansion of an existing trail project rather than a new project. He argued that approximately six miles of trails had already been built without adequate review. V. Walsh also raised concerns about trail encroachment on neighboring

properties, wetlands and drainage, insufficient setbacks and buffers, impacts on neighbors, and weak follow-through on prior conditions. He brings up difficulty reaching anyone through posted contact numbers. V. Walsh pointed out that the parking lot cannot be put anywhere else due to wetlands and asked the Board to scrutinize the application closely.

Anna Lalloy, 150 Library Road - Supported the proposed trail system. She emphasized Saratoga PLAN's conservation record and experience managing preserves and parking areas throughout Saratoga County. She said pedal-assist e-bikes can make outdoor recreation more accessible to older adults and people with disabilities, while noting that the Board should decide whether e-bikes are allowed. She also described her involvement with the Graphite Range Community Forest Advisory Committee and expressed hope that a high-quality trail system could be implemented in Greenfield. She respects the process of including the community.

Larry Ramsey, 347 Greene Rd - states the surrounding Open Space Institute and state-owned lands, along with connecting trails, directly affect his one-acre property. L. Ramsey argued that the proposed Wilton Road parking lot would connect users to trails leading toward his backyard. He described prior disagreements over land and parking proposals, reported late-night activity and a confrontation at the Tupelo parking lot, and questioned the need for additional parking lots when access already exists from Route 9.

T. Yasenchak adjourned the Public Hearing at 9:36 p.m.

T. Yasenchak clarified that the trails in Wilton are outside of Greenfield's jurisdiction and that the Planning Board's review is limited to the proposed Greenfield trail. She also stated that this project is separate from the Tupelo project, although both trail systems are expected to meet the same applicable standards. T. Yasenchak noted that the Planning Board is not an enforcement body. She reiterated that development on a private property must follow the required site plan and Planning Board review process. She also stated that this Planning Board was not involved in any prior discussions or agreements between the County and any former Town Officials.

After Board discussion the Applicant is requested to provide:

- Updated signage
- Operating rules
- Emergency service and Sherriff correspondence
- Maintenance plan details
- Parking controls to indicate where each spot is located, as well as preventing cars from parking in undesignated spots
- Landscaping and buffer updates
- Clarifications from DEC/Army Corp of Engineers and Town Engineer regarding wetlands
- Clarification of driveway grading

The Board scheduled a visit to the project site location for September 26, 2026, to gain more information about terrain and location to neighbors.

Before the meeting is adjourned, R. Roeckle introduces an Applicant that was not put on the agenda due to a miscommunication. Brian Palmateer, of 374 Wilton Rd, will be in front of the Board for a Site Plan Review pending a violation involving a garage apartment built in 2008 that has not obtained a Certificate of Occupancy. The property contains three residences and review by the Zoning Board of Appeals is needed to determine the required approvals and any needed variances before the Planning Board can act. T. Yasenchak will recuse herself from the project. Board members acknowledge that B. Palmateer is taking steps to remedy the violation and enforcement action may be put on hold while the process proceeds.

Meeting Adjourned by R. Roeckle at 9:56 p.m.
