

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

March 31, 2026

Regular Meeting

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by T. Yasenchak, Chair, at 7:01 pm. On roll call the following members are present: R. Roeckle, C. Dake, S. Licciardi, B. Podhajecki, and C. Ronk (Alternate). B. Duffney and J. Sabanos are absent. J. Reckner, Building Inspector, is absent. E. Faas, Executive Secretary, is present. C. Ronk has full voting privileges.

Approval of Minutes

February 24, 2026 – Postponed

March 10, 2026 – Postponed

New Business

683 Saratoga Road, LLC

Public Hearing Notice from the Town of Wilton

TM # 140.-3-9

683 Saratoga Road

T. Yasenchak announces our first order of new business is at 683 Saratoga Road, LLC. The Town of Greenfield received a letter from the Town of Wilton stating that 683 Saratoga Road LLC has applied to the Wilton Town Board for a Planned Development District to allow the construction of two three-story mixed-use buildings along Saratoga Road and seven ten-unit condominium buildings. The Wilton Town Board is holding an in-person Public Hearing regarding this Application on Thursday, April 2, 2026 at 7:00 pm at the Wilton Town Hall.

The Board discusses the proposed development project and about the steep slope of the proposed construction site and how it will make construction difficult. They note that the area has public water and sewer service, so the project would likely use them. The Board agrees that since access would be from Route 9 in Wilton, the project should not affect the Town of Greenfield. The Board agrees that there is no need for neighbor notifications due to the short notice we were given regarding the Public Hearing, as well as the location of the project. E. Faas will draft a letter to the Town of Wilton stating that after review, the Board sees no planning or intermunicipal concerns from the Town of Greenfield regarding the proposed project.

The Applicant, Hal Raven, is present. H. Raven explains that the railway has operated for the last three years under a temporary special use permit while leasing two parcels. The special use permit was obtained to include dinner trains, weddings and other events. The Applicant states that it was a three-year term due to the fact that they had a three-year lease on the property. The Applicant states they are now purchasing one parcel and seeking a permanent special use permit under the same conditions, with no operational changes.

T. Yasenchak confirms with the Applicant that they he plans to purchase just one parcel at the moment. She goes on to tell the Applicant that the special use permit that was previously granted, was when the Applicant was leasing both properties at the same time, and it seems that the Code Enforcement Official at the time did not feel a Zoning Variance was needed. T. Yasenchak states to the Applicant that it was reviewed as a recreational facility, and both of the pieces of property were under the Applicant's direct control. T. Yasenchak continues to say that the three years are up, and when there is a special use permit that has been granted, if the property is changing hands, that would also trigger the need for the Applicant to come before the Board to have the SUP transferred. One thing that our current Code Enforcement Official J. Reckner noted is that the piece of property the Applicant is purchasing is less than the required acreage for recreational in the LDR zone.

H. Raven replies they are continuing to lease the additional property for the time being, and his long-term intent is to acquire additional land to meet acreage requirements. The Applicant also states that he has pre-emptively applied for variance and will be in front of the Zoning Board on April 7, 2026.

T. Yasenchak tells the Applicant that since he is appearing soon before the Zoning Board for a variance, the Board will review with the one parcel, for a permanent special use permit. The Board cannot approve without the variance, but until that occurs the Board can review in this manner.

R. Roeckle reiterates the Board cannot issue the special use permit without the variance being granted from the Zoning Board. He states he would have no problems with reissuing the special use permit once the variance is granted.

T. Yasenchak states the Zoning Board typically ask the Planning Board for an advisory opinion of the variance before they grant it. Since the Applicant has already been operating for three years and there will be no operational changes, the Board will provide an advisory opinion in favor of granting the area variance for the Zoning Board so they have a chance to review it ahead of their next meeting.

The Board acknowledges the Applicant's successful operation as well as his community evlvement and are in agreeance that they see no problems with issuing a Special Use permit contingent upon the Zoning Board granting a variance. The Applicant is told the Planning Board will still need to schedule a public hearing for this case, and will tentatively schedule one for May 12, 2026 based upon approval at the Zoning Board meeting.

Applicant representative Chris Foss of Ferguson and Foss Surveyors of Johnstown, NY is present. The Applicant is proposing a three-lot minor subdivision at 439 Middle Grove Road. The Applicant brought this project in front of the Board 3-4 years ago. He states there were some problems brought up with the project at the time and he had since tabled the project. He states that his client wanted to bring it back in front of the Board to see what they could do with the property. The current proposal includes a creation of three lots from an existing parcel including a boundary line adjustment involving the adjacent property (owned by the Monroe's). The parcel is split between Town Center (TC) and Low-Density Residential (LDR) zoning districts. C. Foss states that is a three-lot subdivision of Ballwin's Garage on Middle Grove Road. He states there is one lot on Lake Desolation Road and two lots coming off of Middle Grove Road. Of the lots on Middle Grove, the Applicant states that one lot is vacant and the other lot has the garage on it. The Applicant states the complicating factor is the fact that zoning line goes right through the middle of the property. He believes it was 500 feet from the edge of the road. T. Yasenchak states she believes the Applicant would need to acquire a variance for the portions of the lots that are in LDR. Applicant states that he believed that to be correct.

T. Yasenchak reads the review letter submitted by J. Reckner. In the letter J. Reckner states that this parcel has an existing Special Use Permit for an Auto Repair Shop granted/approved on July 16, 1998. The letter states the Applicant shall provide, in writing, if they intend to continue this Special Use Permit, as this may require additional approvals. The letter states that the Applicant shall provide all dimensions to both proposed and existing structures to property lines to verify zoning compliance. The letter states that "Lot 1" appears to be a "keyhole lot" and that keyhole lots may be permitted under section 105-137 of the Town of Greenfield Code. J. Reckner states in his letter the frontage is shown to be 30 feet and that the requirement for a keyhole lot shall be 40 feet. This will require a variance be granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals prior to approval. He states all other information required by section 105-137 shall be shown to verify zoning compliance. J. Reckner states in his review letter that "Lot 2" appears to be zoning compliant for the Town of Greenfield's TC zoning district, however the proposed home is shown to be within the LDR zoning district. The letter states that under 105-13 (d), this will need to comply with the Town of Greenfield's LDR zoning district regulations and these dimensions shall be clearly shown to verify zoning compliance. The letter states that "Lot 3" appears to be zoning compliant in regard to frontage and lot size. The dimensions shall be shown from property lines to existing structures to verify zoning compliance. The final note on J. Reckner review letter states that the submitted subdivision map states keyhole lots shall be constructed to support a 35,000 lb. vehicle. Town Code 105-137 (c) states this to be 50,000 lbs. and that this shall be corrected to show compliance. The letter also states that the driveway length shall be provided to verify compliance with section 511 of the 2025 Fire Code of NYS.

During Board discussion, R. Roeckle he has concern with whether or not the lots are acceptable without variances, due to the fact that zoning lines run through the property. R. Roeckle would like clarification from J. Reckner on that. He also has concerns with the keyhole lot having a 90 degree turn in it and narrow access currently, making it difficult for emergency vehicles to navigate safely.

C. Ronk states his concern would also be in the fact that they are in two zones, as well as concerns as to whether or not the Applicant will be able to widen the keyhole lot to 40 ft.

C. Dake expresses concern currently regarding justification of the keyhole lot and that keyhole lots are typically reserved for unique site constraints, not for increasing lot yield. C. Dake mentions the Comp Plan suggests we avoid keyhole lots when possible. T. Yasenchak agrees and makes suggestions to consider an alternative layout, potentially accessing from Lake Desolation Road for improved planning consistency.

S. Licciardi mentions that if you don't have access to lot one off of Lake Desolation Road, he does see site distance for Middle Grove Road. T. Yasenchak states that when reviewing any subdivision, we ask the Applicant to provide stopping site distance at all new driveways per ASHTO standards.

T. Yasenchak instructs the Applicant that next steps before any review can continue will be to await formal written determination from J. Reckner regarding required variances, consider alternative design options to minimize variances and improve site layout, provide driveway site distance and access analysis, Submit revised plans to the Planning Department.

Washco, Nick Case # PB-727

SPR/SUP

TM#152.-2-10.11

356 Clinton St

The Applicant is present and is here presenting a request for a Special Use Permit for a garage apartment associated with a structure originally built in 2008. The Applicant states that the changes were made to the original septic system, which was located north of the garage apartment and was within required setbacks and in a wetland buffer. The Town required review by the DEC. Per DEC requirements, the existing septic system was removed and the removal was witnessed by the DEC. The Applicant states that the only location that a new gravity septic system will fit is on the east side of the garage apartment. Applicant references drawings submitted to the Board to show proposed septic location. The new system has been reviewed and approved by the Town Board of Health and Town Engineer. The Applicant states that modifications to the garage apartment to become compliant will include removing a doorway connecting the garage apartment to an upper-level room and permanently enclosing it. The upper room will be converted to owner-only storage space and will be inaccessible from the apartment and will be accessed via a separate stairway from the garage. The Applicant notes that this modification reduces the apartment size to approximately 951 sq. ft, bringing it into compliance with the zoning limit of 1000 sq. ft. Documentation from the Applicant's Attorney confirms the storage space will not be used as a living space.

T. Yasenchak back tracks to confirm that the garage apartment was originally built as a garage/barn and that somewhere along the line the Applicants finished upstairs without getting the proper permits and it was being rented out after that. She confirms that it was at this point the Town told the Applicants they would need a Special Use Permit, and that is what opened this whole process of needing to modify the apartment because it had been finished too large and beyond what our Town Code allows at the

minimum of 1000 sq ft. T. Yasenchak also states that our Special Use Permits for garage apartments require separate septic, and that is why the Applicant had to find extra space on their property to meet that code. T. Yasenchak states the Applicants did go through the Town Board, which is also the Board of Health, and they did grant approval for the septic system, and it was also reviewed by our Town Engineer. That allowed the Applicant to now come back before the Planning Board for review of the project for a Special Use Permit.

T. Yasenchak opens the public hearing at 7:58 p.m. No one present from the public steps forward to speak. T. Yasenchak reads an email that was submitted as correspondence from a neighbor, Ted Collins of 339 Clinton Street, in support of Nick and Susan Washco's application. The Board closes the public hearing at 7:59 p.m.

The Board begins SEQRA Review of Part 1. During review of Part I, T. Yasenchak notices the Applicant has checked the wrong box for "will the proposed action connect to an existing wastewater utility". She states the answer is no, since the Applicant will be putting a new one in. Answer is changed on Part 1 and the Applicant initials where the changes have been made. The Board continues with review of SEQRA Part II Impact Assessment. All questions are answered "no". The Board moves on to review Part III Determination of Significance. A motion is made to check the second box, indicating a Negative Declaration (the proposed project will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts).

MOTION: C. Dake

Second: C. Ronk

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board completes SEQRA review indicating a Negative Declaration, stating this project located at 356 Clinton St, TM # 152.-2-10.11, will not result in any significant environmental impacts.

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

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: B. Duffney and J. Sabanos

The Board goes through review of all required criteria for Special Use Permit, and all criteria are found to be satisfactorily met. T. Yasenchak clarifies with the Applicant that granting of a Special Use Permit goes with the owner and not the land. If the Applicant ever chooses to sell their property, the new owners will need to come before the Board to review the SUP.

A motion is made to grant a permanent special use permit contingent upon the Applicant modifying their floor plan to reduce the square footage of the apartment to be under 1000 square feet and therefore compliant with Town Law.

MOTION: R. Roekel

SECOND: C. Dake

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby grants approval for a Permanent Special Use Permit for Nick and Susan Washo, property located at 356 Clinton Street, TM# 152.-2-10.11, contingent upon:

- The Applicant modifying their floor plan to reduce the square footage of the apartment to be under 1000 square feet, achieved by removal of interior access and conversion of space to storage as proposed, thereby achieving compliance with the Town Law

VOTE: Ayes: R. Roeckel, C. Dake, T. Yasenchak, C. Ronk, B. Podhajecki, S. Licciardi

Noes: NONE

ABSTAIN: NONE

ABSENT: B. Duffney and J. Sabanos

55 and 65 Wilton Road LLC Case # PB-26-006

PUD

TM#

59 Wilton Road

This application is in front of the Board for Old Business as well as a public hearing. The application is for 55 & 65 Wilton Road LLC, for Planned Unit Development under our zoning code and the location is 59 Wilton Road. T. Yasenchak states that the Planning Board is not a legislative body. The Board is here as a review agent for the Town Board. John Cannie is present of Cannie Law PLLC representing 55 and 65 Wilton Road LLC. The Applicant has submitted nothing new prior to this meeting and gives a summary of the project – CARAM PUD. J. Cannie recaps this is an amendment to an existing PUD originally established in 1981. Proposed plans are to:

- Expand the PUD boundaries to include 65 Wilton Road (currently zoned LDR)
- Update and clarify permitted uses and development limitations
- Reduce allowed residential density to three single-family residences, all of which currently exist (primary residence, guest house, and farm manager residence)
- Rename the PUD to 'CAREM'
- Aligning height, setback and bulk requirements with LDR zoning standards
- Clarify administrative approval authority for limited site plan modifications. The amendment proposes that site plan modifications adding less than 2,000 square feet of impervious surface, excluding single-family homes), may be approved administratively by the Planning Board Chair in consultation with the Zoning Officer
- Provide flexibility for agricultural accessory structures related to horse farming operations, with an expanded list for agricultural purposes with numeric limitation, to allow operational flexibility
- Observation towers and farm stands have been removed from permitted uses within the PUD
- Open development has been removed from the PUD language
- Structures with prior certificates of occupancy/ use or shown on approved site plans would be considered legally existing and receives Grandfathered status
- PUD Drafted with the assumption of continued common ownership, with implications discussed for future ownership changes

The parcels share a common border and have historically supported a mix of residential and agricultural uses, including horse stables and related facilities.

T. Yasenchak opens the public hearing at 8:34.

Ms. Einhorn of 75 Wilton Road is present. She comments that the Mosher's have not acted very responsibly, nor have they met the requirements of the approvals of prior building permits that have been issued. She states there seems to be a disregard for compliance, and she does not believe they should be allowed to proceed with new proposals of this PUD until all codes, specifications and requirements are fulfilled with the approval of projects that have already been completed. Just to cite one example, Ms. Einhorn refers to a manure pit that sits on her property line and hence is out of compliance. She states that despite repeated requests from her and the Town to move the manure pit back to meet setback requirements, it still sits on her property line. She states that it has been this way for at least a decade. She states that from her understanding this new PUD would essentially wipe the slate clean, and erase prior obligations, suggesting non-compliant or unpermitted work done in the past would now just be wiped away. Ms. Einhorn states this should not be acceptable and is unacceptable to her.

Vince Walsh of 300 Greene Road speaks next. He echoes everything Ms. Einhorn mentioned. Mr. Walsh is not a neighbor; however, he is a longtime resident. He states that he has a lot of concern about this project. He is glad that the current proposed language does not include subdivisions and expresses concerns over the private roadways and the locations of them, stating there is not much of a buffer to adjacent neighborhoods. Mr. Walsh brings up the possibility of light pollution from the new proposed garage from headlights facing neighbors. He questions if all the buildings on the property were built with permits and if they are compliant. Mr. Walsh brings up the possibility of fertilizer runoff.

Mario Martinez lives next to property. Asks if the Applicant is just expanding the farm and asks if any new residences are being proposed. J. Cannie states no new residences are being proposed just expansion of the footprint of the current residence.

Public Hearing is adjourned at 8:44 p.m. to be re-opened in the future.

Before the Board comments, J. Cannie states that he wants to make it clear to the Board and the public that there are no outstanding violations with respect to this property or any buildings on it. He states that if there were any violations previously, they have all been resolved.

T. Yasenchak refers to the manure pit mentioned by Ms. Einhorn during the public hearing and asks J. Cannie if where the manure is currently being stored is compliant with approval. J. Cannie states that he cannot speak to the location of the manure pit because he has not been physically on site to inspect it. T. Yasenchak states that when reviewing a plan, she suggests taking the part out of the code language that anything that is shown on the plan is automatically grandfathered in. J. Cannie states that he is referring to anything that has been given a Certificate of Occupancy or Compliance to be grandfathered in. T. Yasenchak points out that there may be situations on the property where something may have been approved to be in one location and moved after the fact and is no longer compliant. T. Yasenchak and R. Roeckle suggest having Code Enforcement do a property inspection to verify Code Compliance. J. Cannie agrees.

R. Roeckle brings up his concern with setbacks the Applicant has listed in the PUD. He states the language will need to clearly distinguish between district boundary setbacks and internal lot line setbacks. He states that Building Code does not allow building on a property line. J. Cannie states that what they are proposing is that there will not be any construction across lot lines in the future to alleviate that concern, with the caveat that they remain under common ownership. R. Roeckle states there should be language written in the PUD to address the way the setbacks are written if there are different owners of the internal properties. He states that just because there is a PUD boundary, that doesn't mean it will always be owned by the same people. R. Roekel states those property lines would have to be a minimum of something and should be addressed in the PUD language.

C. Ronk has no questions or comments until revisions have been submitted. B. Podhajecki agrees with having Code Enforcement going on site to verify compliance and thinks it is an excellent idea and has no further comments until revisions are submitted.

There is a discussion between Borad members regarding how much development flexibility should be allowed within a PUD without full Planning Board site plan review, particularly for agricultural structures such as barns, run-in sheds, and support buildings. Several Borad embers express discomfort with the uncertainty of the previously proposed language, worrying that buildings could be constructed without sufficient oversight. There is concern from the Board about when and how final site plan review occurs, and whether the proposed language clearly requires Board involvement for projects with considerable changes being made. Discussion continues regarding what buildings would be considered agricultural. Some examples discussed are the potential of buildings being labeled as agricultural, then possibly later being used as garages, or processing facilities as examples. The Board emphasizes needing clear language, giving the Code Enforcement Officer authority to determine when a structure is not truly agricultural and will need to return to the Planning Board for review.

The Board will wait for new language to be submitted for their review and reiterates that more clarity and better definitions of terms are needed in the PUD language including when Planning Board oversight is required, setbacks, agricultural building use clarification, and common ownership provisions. The Applicant agrees to revise and provide updated draft language. No final decisions have been made at this meeting. The Planning Board keeps the Public Haring open, to allow for review of revised documentation and additional public comment.

Foothills/Walsh. V Case #PB 26-007

SPR

TM# 139.-1-88

160 Wilton Road

V. Walsh is present. The Applicant was in front of the Board previously for Site Plan Review involving an agricultural and wood-based business that he operates. It was decided previously by the Board that he

would need to submit revisions to his previously submitted Site Plans. The Applicant gives an overview of the project. The property is approximately 5 acres, surrounded mostly by woods. Existing structures include greenhouses; a pole shed, an old farmhouse and other outbuildings. Use of the property includes agricultural processing, retail sales (lumber and wood products), mushroom cultivation, wood chip and log storage, and small contractor / storage yard operations. The Applicant submitted revisions to the site plan showing: Locations for wood chips; Log and lumber storage; Two driveway entrances (eastern and western); Parking areas for customers, employees and wood trucks; Two septic systems and an outhouse. The Applicant states that most biomass storage will be set back 50-100 feet or more from the road. The Applicant tells the Board that in the revisions, a small wetland on the corner of the property is avoided. He states that wood chip storage fire risk is addressed: piles are far below industrial size limits, chips have enough moisture content, they are stored loosely and not compacted. He states that tree planting and buffering includes spruce, cedar and other conifers for visual screening, noise reduction, and moisture retention for mushroom beds.

A Public Hearing regarding the project is opened by T. Yasenchak at 10:07 pm.

Robert Chase of 154 Wilton Road is present and expresses concern with the right-of-way due to a ditch next to it. He states there is not enough room.

Kathy Peyser of 137 Wilton Road is present, and states concern over the wastewater from the sawmill into the wetlands. She asks the Applicant if he has wood brought in, to which he answers "no". She inquires about hours of operation.

T. Yasenchak adjourns the Public Hearing at 10:14 pm.

During discussion from the Board regarding the Applicant's submitted revisions, concerns are raised over unclear property lines, lack of a survey showing exact boundaries, and uncertainty whether parking and storage fully meet setbacks. Members agree the submitted map is difficult to read and still lacks required details. For example: exact locations of number of parking spots, where work truck vehicles are stored, where is septic and how much space does that take up, etc. The Board states they cannot approve a site plan without a more detailed site plan, confirmation of property boundaries, confirmation of setbacks and parking locations relative to the road right-of-way.

Meeting Adjourned at 10:51 pm

Respectfully Submitted By:

Erika Faas

Executive Secretary Planning Board

DRAFT